

A Collection of severall

REPLIES

AND

VINDICATIONS

Published of late, most of them,
In Defence of the
CHURCH of ENGLAND.

By

HEN: HAMMOND, D.D.

13

Now put together in three Volumes.

I PET. 3. 15.

Ἐγώ μιν ὅ ἀεὶ ὡς ἀπολογία παντὶ καὶ αἰσῶνι ὑμᾶς λόγον δεῖ τὸν ὑμῖν
ἐλπίσθαι, καὶ παύσασθαι καὶ φόβου.

L O N D O N,

Printed for R. ROYSTON, at the Angel in Ivie-lane.
M. DC. LVII.

Thom. Tanner



A Collection
Of such DISCOURSES and ANSWERS,
Wherein
The DISSERTATIONS
Concerning
EPISCOPACY
Are defended against
The Ministers of London,

AND
The Authour of the *PREFACE* to
The Saints Perseverance.
Written from Oxford.

WITH
Severall other Discourses in the Defence
OF
HUGO GROTIUS,
BY
HENRY HAMMOND, D.D.

The first Volume.

L O N D O N,
Printed for R. ROYSTON, at the Angel in Ivie-lane,
M.DC.LVII.



A
VINDICATION
OF THE
DISSERTATIONS
CONCERNING
EPISCOPACIE:

From the ANSWERS, or
EXCEPTIONS offered against
them by the London Ministers; in their
pro Divinum Ministerii Evangelici.

By H. HAMMOND, D.D.



L O N D O N,
Printed by J. G. for Richard Royston, at the Angel
in Ivy-lane, 1654.

THE SCOPACIE
CONCERNING
DISEASES
OF THE
VINDICATION

From the Army and Navy
Expenditures of 1890
The Department of the Interior
The Department of the Treasury
The Department of the War



Printed by J. G. for Richard Rogers, at the Angel
in London, 1824.

TO THE READER.



IN Erasmus's distribution of his owne writings into *Tomes*, the 8th. we finde thus inscribed by him, *Octavum occupent Apologie. Me miserum. Et haustum volumen efficient.* It was his great infelicity, that the *Apologies* and *Answers* to exceptions and calumpnies, which he was constrained to write, made up an intire large *Volume in folio*. Now though I have that pleasure in the temper of that person, which gives me security, by the *Romanists Proverbe*, never to be deemed one of their good *Catholicks*, and so may probably partake of some part of his fate, yet 't were great insolence in me, who have not troubled the World with a *sensib* proportion to that werewith he hath favoured it, to expect the *Tithe* of that consideration, which is required to make one capable of that degree of infelicity, which lay a full load on him; Neverthelesse these few last moneths have given me a tast and *deixis* what I am to expect. For besides the reproaches of one learned Gentleman (to which, being barely such, I have no one word to retribute, but that of the *ευλογειν* which *Christ* directs me to) I have farther met with some variety; Many exceptions, though little of continually from these *Assemblies*; More, and in a very distant

Character from a large *Preface* of *Animadversions* on the *Dissertations* sent me lately from *Oxford*; others also there are which I have not yet had leasure to weigh, but soon purpose and hope to do it; and if either I discern my selfe, or finde it the opinion of others, that what is already said in the *Traacts*, which they oppose, be not sufficient to prevent, or remove the *scruples* proposed by them, I shall willingly dedicate some time of *vacancy* to that imployment. At the present, the *Exceptions* of the *London Ministers* have challenged the *precedence*, and here are offered to consideration. And because the *Preface* from *Oxford* falls on the same sort of matter, *Episcopacy* and *Ignatius's Epistles*, as they are defended in the *Dissertations*, I purpose, God-willing, that an *Answer* to that shall now follow, as soone as the *Printer* can dispatch it. And that is all that I had to say to the *Reader* by way of *Preface*.



THE TABLE.

CHAP. I.

Concerning the Angels of the Churches of Asia.
Page 9.

Section 1.

- The grounds of affirming them to be Bishops.* Ibid.
Sect. 2. *Of Timothy, of Onesimus, of Policarpe,* p. 15.
Sect. 3. *Of the negative argument from S. John's not using the word Bishop. Of Πρεσβύτερος in the Revelation;* p. 19
Sect. 4. *Of S. Johns writings. Again of Diotrephes,* p. 25
Sect. 5. *Of S. John's being Bishop of Asia. Of the Apostles being Bishops,* p. 29
Sect. 6. *Of the word Angel, and Star, pretended to be common to all Ministers. Of Messenger, and Embassadour. The singularity of the word Angel,* p. 35
Sect. 7. *Of their exception to our arguing from Symbols: Of Bishop and Elder being the same,* p. 38
Sect. 8. *Of the singularity of each Angel. The objections from the use of the plurall number,* p. 41
Sect. 9. *Of the Elders at Ephesus Act. 20.* p. 45
Sect. 10. *Of expressing a number by singulars. A Church by a Candlestick. Of the seven Angels Rev. 8.* p. 47
Sect. 11. *Of the Epistles being sent to the whole Church, not to the Bishop only. Of Timothy, Onesimus and Polycarp, being Bishops of some of the Asian Churches, without any charge of Apostacy falling on them by this meanes,* p. 50
Sect. 12. *Of Timothy's being an Evangelist, that it hinders not his being a Bishop.* p. 53
Sect. 13. *Of the Bishops at Ephesus. Of the plural number in the Epistle to the Angel of Smyrna,* p. 56
Sect. 14. *Of Beza's interpretation, of the President,* p. 57.
Sect.

The Table.

- Sect. 15. *Of Dr. Reynolds interpretation, of the Bishop in Cyprian. Of Ordination by Bishops not without Presbyters, from the Testimonies of Cyprian, and Firmilian,* p. 51
- Sect. 16. *Of the Churches of Asia being Metropolitically. Of the paucity of believers,* p. 54
- Sect. 16. *Of modelling Churches according to the Government of the Roman state. Of exemplars of Metropolitans among the Jews. Testimonies of the Apostles instituting Metropolitans,* p. 67
- Sect. 17. *Of the objection against Metropolises from the seven Starres in seven Churches,* p. 71
- Sect. 18. *Of the use of the word Bishop for Archbishop in Tertullian: Of Angel in Christs Epistle.* p. 64
- Sect. 19. *Of division into Parishes, and Union into Diocesses. Of Diocesan Bishops in the Apostles dayes. Elders in every Church, Act. 14. Elders of the Church, Act. 20. That place vindicated from exception.* p. 75

CHAP. II.

- O**F the equivalence of the words Bishop and Elder in the New Testament. p. 92
- Sect. 1. *Four sorts of equivalence of these words proposed,* Ibid.
- Sect. 2. *Of the word Ἐπίσκοπος, &c.,* p. 95
- Sect. 3. *Of the word Ἠγούμενος &c. Elder,* p. 100
- Sect. 4. *Of reverence to Antiquity, and the interpretations of the Antients. Of Prelatists disagreement among themselves,* 102.
- Sect. 5. *Inconveniencies objected, and answered. Of more Bishops in one City. No Presbyters in the Apostles dayes. The no Divine right of the order of Presbyters,* p. 105
- Sect. 6. *A first confession objected and vindicated. Of the Ephesine Presbyters being all the Prelates of Asia, Elders, Aldermanzi,* p. 108
- Sect. 7. *A second confession of the Bishops, Phil. 1. 1. being Bishops of that whole Province, Philippi a Metropolis, and a Colony,* p. 110
- Sect. 8. *A third confession, of Timothies being an Archbishop.* Of

The Table.

- Of the qualifications, 1 Tim. 3. 2. belonging to Bishops. Of the Bishops being worthy of double honour, though he never preach. Of the word, and Doctrine. Of the Presbytery, 1 Tim. 4. Of Rebuking and receiving accusation against an Elder.* p. 112
- Se&t. 9. A fourth confession of Titus being Archbishop of Crete,* p. 116
- Se&t. 10. A first charge of contrariety to Scripture answered. Of visitation of the sick, belonging to Elders, James 5.* p. 118.
- Se&t. 11. A last objection from Act. 21. 18. and 14. 3. and 11. 30. answered. Elders for Rulers or Bishops.* p. 122

CHAP. III.

- C**oncerning the Opinion of Antiquity in this Question. Page 129.
- Se&t. 1. The Testimonies of Clemens Romanus, Bishops and Deacons the onely offices at the first. Corinth Metropolis of Achaia. What $\chi\omega\epsilon\alpha$ signifies. The Apostles care to prevent contentions about Episcopacy. Hegesippus's testimony of the contentions at Corinth. Clement a Bishop,* p. 129.
- Se&t. 2. The Testimony of Policarpe. That he was himselfe a Bishop. His mention of Ignatius's Epistles, fit to give authority to them, being so confirmed as it is by a series of the Antients,* p. 139.
- Sect. 3. A vindication of Ignatius's Epistles, Vossius's edition of them, and the Archbishops of Armagh. Some Testimonies out of them, The cause of his so inculcating obedience to Bishops. Mr. Caufabones Testimony considered, and the Allegations from the Archbishop of Armagh. Three reasons against these Epistles answered (No Marriage without the Bishop.) Of the Reformed Churches. Of the Church of Scotland after the first conversion,* p. 143.
- Sect. 4. Of Salmasius's conceit that these Epistles were written at the time of Episcopacy first entering the Church.* p. 163.
- Sect. 5. Testimonies of Iraneus, The use of Presbyteri for Bishops,* p. 165.
- Sect.

The Table: T. III

- Sect. 5. *Testimonies of Tertullian, Seniores & Majores nam
for Bishops, so in Firmilian.* p. 169
- Sect. 6. *S. Jerom's Testimony of Bishops, &c. by Apostolical
Tradition. Consuetudo opposed to Dominica dispositio.
S. Jerom's meaning evidenced by many other Testimonies to
be, that Bishops were instituted by the Apostles. So by Pa-
normitan also. The Testimonies of Isidore, &c. the Council
of Auen, and of Leo vindicated. Of Ischyas's Ordination.
The testimony of the Synod ad Zurrium, and of the 4th Coun-
cell of Carthage.* p. 171
- Sect. 7. *The Testimonies of Ambrose and Austin. Consignare
used for consecrating the Eucharist, and that belonged to the
Bishop when present.* p. 187
- Sect. 8. *Of the Chorepiscopi,* p. 189
-



A
VINDICATION
OF THE

Dissertations concerning *Episcopacy*,
From the Answers or Exceptions offered
against them by the *London-Ministers* in their
ſus Divinum Ministerii Evangelici.

The INTRODUCTION.

*Of the occasion of this Worke, The state
of the Controverſie, The Heads of the Prelatiſts
Plea, from Scripture and Antiquity, with ſome
Observations aſiſtant to them. The conſiderable
concernements of the queſtion.*



Being advertiſed from many hands, that the Num. 1.
Booke called *ſus Divinum Ministerii Evan-
gelici*, which is lately publiſhed by ſome, who
intitle themſelves the *Provinciall Aſſembly*
of *London*, hath undertaken to conſider and
confute many paſſages of the *Dissertations*,
three years ſince publiſhed in *Latine*, in defence of *Episcopacy*,
B
againſt

against D. *Blondell* and others, I have thought my selfe obliged to examine whether there be any thing objected by them in relation to those *Dissertations*, which may reasonably move me to retract what was there either with diffidence proposed, or more confidently asserted by me.

2. And having diligently surveyed the whole *Booke*, that I might omit no passage, wherein my interests might be in the least concern'd. & being truly able to affirme from that view, that it hath yielded me no one syllable of usefull *Exhortation*, no motive to retract any period, or alter any expression in those *Dissertations* (but as farre, as I doe perswade my selfe that this *Provinciall Synod* containes in it Men of judgement and abilities to maintaine the truth and convince gaine-sayers, so farre I am forced to assume, that what I have written is testified to be *Truth*, and by that priviledge competently secured against all opposers) I might herein reasonably acquiesce, without farther importuning the Reader or my selfe with impertinent vindications, onely trusting and adventuring the whole matter to the judgement of each intelligent Reader, who is obliged by all Rules of Justice to compare either by his *Memory*, or by his *Eye* those passages in this *Booke*, and the *Chapters* in the *Dissertations* to which they are confronted.

3. But I am againe told that many, who have read and are moved by the *Arguments* and *Answers* of this *Booke*, and the *Authority* of a *Provinciall Synod*, are yet disabled to be so just as to examine them by comparing them with the *latine Dissertations*, and that we are fallen upon those times wherein whatsoever is not answered, is cried up as unanswerable (an humour, of which, if I might be permitted to receive the fruits, I should have no temptation to complaine, there being so much a greater part of those *Dissertations*, which was never attempted to be answered) I continue still under some seeming obligation to give an exact account of the whole matter as it lies in contest betweene this *Provinciall Synod* and those *Dissertations*, and I shall hasten to doe it, when I have first by way of necessary *Introduction* premised these two things.

4. First, the *state* of the *Controversy*, as it generally lies between us, which is this; whether the *Apostles* of *Christ*, when they planted *Churches* in each *City*, left them in the hands of *many* to be governed by the *Common Councell* of those *many*, erecting an *equality* or *parity* of severall *Rulers* in every *City*, to whom all others were subjected, and they to none: or whether they placed the *Superiour* power and *Authority* in some *one*, and subjected all others to him. Other consequent differences there are arising from hence, (and those of such *weight* and *concernment* to those with whom I now dispute, in case the *Truth* be not on their sides, as will make this *returne* to their *Objections*, no lesse than a duty of *Charity*, as to *Brethren*, if by the *Grace* of *God* they shall judge it *reasonable* to make that use of it) but this is the one *Basis* of all, whether the *Apostles* planted *parity* or *imparity* in the *Church*, *many* equall *Governours* in one *City*, or but *one* in each; The former is the *Presbyterians* interest to defend, the latter the *Prelatists*; And so the controversy stands between them to be debated and evinced by such evidences as a matter of *Fact* is capable of, (the *Right* being by both sides acknowledged to follow that *Fact*) i. e. by the *Testimonies* of those who are fit to be credited in this matter.

Secondly, the *briefe heads* of the *Plea*, by which I have undertaken to maintaine the *Prelatists* assertion, 1. By *Scripture*, 2. By the *Records* of the first times, the *Writings* of those who were nearest the *Apostles*, and either affirm what was done by the *Apostles*, or how it stood practiced in the *Churches*, all the *World* over, which were planted by them. As for the *third way* of arguing from the *universall* consent and practice of all *Churches* for about 1400. yeares together, i. e. from about the yeare 140. till the *Reformation*. this I doe not insist on, as I might with all evidence, because it is knowne and confessed by the *Adversaries*, and all that is by them pretended, is, that *parity* and *equality* being prescribed and practiced by the *Apostles* soone after their death, and quite contrary to their plat-forme, *Prelacy* was introduced into all *Churches*; It being their desire and demand now (a little different from what *M. Calvin* at first proposed to the

Churches of Helvetia) that all may be reformed and reduced to the state wherein the *Apostles* left it.

6. In the managing the proofes proposed by mee, I have used this method, which seemed to mee most convincing, 1. To insit on some few *Testimonies* under each head, which are sufficient to conclude the matter on the *Prelatists* side; and then to propose some observations, which may accord all other places both of *Scripture* and *antient* writers, with those *Testimonies* and that conclusion.

7. The speciall proofes of *Scripture* are taken, First, from the power derived (as from God the Father, to Christ, so) from Christ to the *Apostles*; not as to a Common councill of *sociall Rulers*, but as so many severall planters and Governours of the Church, each having all power committed to him, and depending on no conjunction of any one or more *Apostles* for the exercise of it; And this is largely and clearly deduced *Dissert. 3. c. 1. 2. 3. 4.* And this power being by them derived to *Bishops* in each City, in the same manner as they used it themselves (which is also farther evidenced and vindicated, c. 5. &c.) this was deemed a first competent proofe of this matter, and as a confirmation of it, it was observable, that the first *Bishops* made by them, were in the very *Scripture* called *Apostles*, James the Bishop of Jerusalem, &c. *Diss. 4. c. 3.*

8. A second principall proofe of *Scripture* is taken from the severall mentions of the so many Churches of Asia, and the so many Angels assigned to them, one to each, as a singular Governour or Bishop in the Revelation. And in discourse of these wee have found great evidence of the fact to authorize us to improve the conclusion a little higher, than was necessary to the defence of the maine cause; viz. to affirme of these Angels, that each of them was an Archbishop or Metropolitan, and having done so to discern upon undeniable grounds that there were many other such, mentioned in the *Scripture* (though not under that title) as James the brother of the Lord, Metropolitan of all Judea, Titus of all Crete, with an hundred Cities in it, &c.

9. And the wayes of according all other *Scriptures* with these

these have been briefly these. 1. By observing this difference betwixt Cities and Metropoles, as the true cause and occasion of the mentions of many *Bishops* in (not of) one City, meaning thereby the *Bishops* of all the Cities under that *Metropolis* as *Phil. 1. 1. Act. 20. 17.* Secondly, by examining the Nature of all the words, which I conceived to be used in Scripture for *Bishops*, as (beside *Apostle* and *Angel* forementioned) Ἐπίσκοπος, *Bishop*, ἡγούμενος, *Ruler*, Διδάσκαλος, *Doctor*, Ποιμήν, *Pastor*, Πρεσβυς, *President*, Πρεσβύτερος, *Elder* (and in the *Fathers*, Ἀρχιερεύς, *Chiefe Priest*, and *Sacerdos*, *Priest*) each denoting *Dignity* and *Authority*, and all cleared to be in their own nature applicable, and by the circumstances of the Context to be actually applied to the singular *Governours* in each City; most of them constantly so, and that one of Πρεσβύτερος, if not constantly so, yet very rarely otherwise: And this is done *Dissert. 4. c. 7.* and so to the end of that *Diss.* Thirdly, by observing the paucity of believers in many Cities in the first *Plantations*, which made it unnecessary that there should by the *Apostles* be ordained any more than a *Bishop* and *Deacon* (one or more) in each City, and that this was accordingly done by them at the first, is approved by the most undeniable *antient Records*. Such as those βασιλῆας ἰσραελ, the profoundest *Histories*, out of which * *Epiphanius* * L. 1. l. 1. makes this Observation; "Ὅπου γέγονε χρεία, καὶ ἦσαν ἀξιόι ἐπισκοπῆς, καλὰς ἀνέστην ἐπισκοποὶ πλῆθους δὲ μὴ οὐκ ἐκ ἐπιθέσσαν ἐν αὐτοῖς πρεσβύτεροι καλὰς ἀδελφῶν, καὶ ἡγεμόνων ὅτι τὰ κατὰ τοὺς μόνον ἐπισκόπων, ἀνευ δε διακόνων ἐπισκοποὶ ἀδυνατοῦν εἶναι, Where there wanted *Bishops*, and there were found persons worthy of the Office, *Bishops* were constituted; but where there was no multitude, there none were found among them to be constituted *Presbyters*, and they satisfied themselves with a *Bishop* alone in a place; Only the *Bishop* could not possibly be without a *Deacon*, and accordingly the *Apostle* took care that the *Bishop* should have his *Deacons* to minister to him. That which is thus cited by *Epiphanius* out of those *Antient Records*, is found clearly affirmed by * *Clemens Romanus*, * *Ep. ad Cor.* an *Apostolicall* person, and witness of the *Apostles* practice; that they being sent out by *Christ*, as hee by his *Father*, went

out Preaching the Gospell, and proclaiming it through Regions and Cities, καθίστανον τὰς ἀπαρχὰς αὐτῶν εἰς ἑπιστάτους & διακόνους τῶν μελλόντων πισύειν, they constituted their first fruits into Bishops and Deacons, of those which should afterward believe. To both which wee shall againe adde what Ephiphanius prefaceth in that place; Νῦν ὅτι τὸ κηρύγμαλὸς πρὸς τὰ ὑποτίπλοντα γράφαι Ἀπόστολον, that when the preaching was new, the Apostle St. Paul wrote agreeably to the present state of affaires. We have here so cleare an account of the reason of the Apostles immediate subjoyning of Deacons to Bishops, Phil. 1. 1. and 1 Tim. 3. (viz. because those were the onely two Orders then constituted in every Church) that these two places (which are made use of by the adversaries against us) are most punctuall evidences of the Truth of ours, and of the unseasonablenesse of their pretentions.

10. As for the Testimonies out of the first Antiquity; The ground-worke I have chosen to lay in Ignatius his Epistles, because the Testimonies thence are so many and so evident, and the Writer so neere the Apostles time (that holy men being Martyr'd in the 10. of Trajan, to whose Reigne St John lived) and most of his Epistles written to the very Churches of Asia planted by St. John, and the Bishops of many of them named by him, and of one Bishop the Presbyters under him, that if that one Authors Testimonies be attended to, there is an absolute decision of the whole matter on the Prelatists side; To which purpose I have also vindicated these Epistles from all that hath been objected to them in these late yeares, and asserted their Authority by as antient and authentick evidences, as can be vouched for any antient piece, next the Holy Scriptures themselves, and contented my selfe with the most pure and uncorrupted Copies and Editions of it.

11. In accord with these Testimonies I have also produced many others out of Clemens Romanus, Hegesippus, Polycarpe, Papias, Polycrates, Justin, Irenæus, Clemens Alexandrinus, Tertullian, and as many of the first times as have said any thing to this matter, and found a full consent in all, and in most irrefragable suffrages, which conclude this whole controversie on the

the *Prolatists* side. To which I have also added some few observations of unquestionable truth, as 1. That of the continuance of the use of *Πρεσβύτεροι*, *Elder*, to signifie *Bishop* (in our *Modern* sense) among some of these most *antient Church writers* (whereas the word *Ἐπίσκοπος* is never used by any, but for a *singular Governour*.) Secondly, that of the distinct *Congregations* of *Jewish* and *Gentile Christians* in the same *City* (the grounds of which are evident in *Scripture*) and consequently of the severall *Governours* or *Bishops* over them (which was usefull for the removing some seeming difficulties in the *Catalogues* of the first *Bishops* of *Rome*, *Antioch*, &c.) and some other the like, not for the serving the *Necessities* of our *Cause*, but as *supernumerary*, and *ex abundanti*. And upon these and such like heads of probation we have built our plea, descending also to a particular survey of *Saint Hierom's testimonies*, which are by the *adversaries* principally made use of against us.

And if what is thus copiously deduced in the *Dissertations*, together with *Answers*, and *refutations* of the principall *Objections* of *Doctor Blondel*, and *Walo Messalinus*, doe really stand in force, and appeare not to be refuted now in whole, or in part, by these men, who have often attempted to *refute* them, I shall then leave them seriously, and *Christianly* to consider but this one thing, and to returne their anger not to me, but to themselves, what *security* of grounds they can build upon in their present *practices*, particularly in their *assuming* to themselves that *power* or *authority* which doth not belong to them; For 1. if the *Praefecture* in each *Church* were (as by *Christ* to the *Apostles*, so) by the *Apostles* given to the *singular Governour* or *Bishop* (by them *καθεσας ἐν πάσι*, constituted over all) and from that time to this, regularly continued in a *succession* of *Bishops* in every *Church*; and secondly, if those which are now called *Presbyters*, were by those, who first instituted them, placed in a *second rank* as of *dignity*, so of *power*, and never had all that power committed to them, which to the *Bishop* was committed, particularly not that of *Ordeining* the meanest *Deacon*, much lesse *Presbyters* with power of *Ordeining* other *Presbyters*; and thirdly if they, on whose *au-*
thority

* *Excepta Ordinatione, Hier. ep. 85, ad Euseb.*

χει γλοριαν
ἐπὶ τῶν ἀνα-
βιβάζοντι ἐ-
πίσκοποι.
Chrysost. Hom.
in 1 Cor.

In Ep. ad Heb.
p 913.

* *Theophylact*
Ibid.

thority they most depend (S.^t *Hierome* the *Presbyter*, &c.) doe expressly assure them, that the *Presbyters* in their times had not power of *Ordination*, but acknowledge the *Bishop* superior to the *Presbyter* in that (and it is not imaginable how that power should be conveyed to any *Presbyter* now, which was not vested in any at that time, nor pretended to be so in above a thousand yeares after them.) And lastly, if no man may take that which is not given him from Heaven (or give that which he hath not) which the *Scripture* yeilds to, as a rule by which both *John Baptist*, *John* 3. 27. and *Christ* himselfe, *Luk*, 12. 14. was to be judged, and the *Apostle*, *Heb*. 5. 4. hath applied that generall rule to this particularity, of *Priesthood* in the *Church*, viz. that no man may λαμβάνειν τιμὴν assume an honour to himselfe, but who is ὑπὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ καλέμενος, called by God, (θεοπεριβαντός, advanced by God, saith *Theophylact*) either immediately or mediately, either by the *Apostles*, or by those which received it successively from them (all others being truly affirmed by the * *Antients* ἐπιτιθεῖν τῇ τιμῇ, to leap into the honour, καὶ νόμον διαρθεῖν (and to corrupt the rule or law by which they should be guided) then I say, upon what solid grounds can they satisfie *Conscience*, who without all pretence of necessity (which by some is here made use of as an excuse) the regular way being open and plaine before them, have run before they were sent, assumed that power to themselves, which belongs not to them, nor was ever by any, which had it, bestowed upon them?

I doe not foresee any more here necessary to be premised to our future debates, and shall therefore hasten to them, as to an unpleasant progresse, that I would willingly be at the end of, and commit all to the grace and unerring judgement of him, whom we all professe to serve and obey in this, as in all other things.

CHAP. I.

Concerning the Angels of the Churches of Asia.

Section I.

The grounds of affirming them to be Bishops.

FOR the vindicating of the *Dissertations* from all the exceptions which are offered against them in the *Books*, which I have now before me ; It is no whit necessary that I give the Reader any the most cursory view of the whole *Booke* ; I shall therefore fall in, though abruptly, on the sixth Chapter of the second part of it. For although in some of the former Chapters of that part, some indeavours are used to assert *Presbytery* against *Episcopacy* by Arguments so frequently produced by that party, that they were every one foreseen ; and in the *Dissertations* largely evidenced to have no validity in them, yet it falls out somewhat to mine owne and the Readers ease, that I am not personally called into the lists, till the beginning of the sixth Chapter ; which by the signall of some *Latine* words in the Margine out of *Dissert. 4. c. 4. Sect. 4.* have markt me out as the person against whom that Chapter was intirely designed, and I shall readily answer the call, and not refuse the paines to examine every *Section* of that Chapter.

Num. 2.

2. The subject of this Chapter is the pretended (as they please to stile it) *Episcopacy* of the seven Asian Angels ; And thus they begin their assault ; The second Scripture ground brought to prove the Divine Rights of *Prelacy*, is from the Angels of the seven Churches of Asia ; These Angels, say they (the Assertors of *Prelacy*) were seven single persons, and (as one hath lately written) not onely Bishops, but *Metropolitans* and *Archbishops*. This is said with so much confidence that all men are condemned as blind or wilfull that endeavour to oppose it : And it is reckoned as one of the great prodigies of this unhappy Age, that Men should still continue

In tantâ luce
adhibus cæcitate
aliquos inser
p. sumi et inau
spicacissimi sa
culi prodigia
numerandum est.

blind, and not see light enough in this Scripture to build the great Fabrick of Episcopacy by Divine Right upon.

3. This is, it seemes, the first crime chargeable on mee as Author of the *Dissertations*, that I am confident of my Assertion, and condemne all others as blind or wilfull that endeavour to oppose it. And although this be no competent way of disproving what is asserted, for it is no universall *maxime* or *Datum* among the *Objectors* that confident asserting should be lookt on as a character of falsity, yet I, that would much more be ashamed to have beene presumptuous than mistaken, and deeme it not a sinne to have erred modestly, am concerned to avert the envy of this their *Proöme*, and to give this essay, how farre any the most moderate speeches may be disguised and deformed by a disadvantageous interpretation.

4. These words [*in tantâ luce*—] lie thus in the *Dissertations*; [*Ad tertium accedo*— I proceede to the third thing, that which concernes the Angels in the *Apocalypse*, that by them are noted so many prefects of the chiefe Cities, or Churches in Asia, whom you may call not onely Bishops, but Primates, Enarchs, or Metropolitans. Each of these things must be briefly taken notice of. First, that each of these were single and properly called Bishops. So Andreas Casariensis pronounceth of them, "Εἰς τὰ ἐκκλησιαστικὰ ἰστέον τοὺς ἑπτά Ἀγγέλους λέγοντας, The seven Ephori (Inspectors or Bishops, so called from the Greeke ἑκκοντοὶ Inspectors, directly equivalent to ἑπείσι) parallel to the number of the seven Churches are in that place of the *Apocalypse* called Angels. This title of Angel is sufficiently knowne from Malach. 2. 7. to belong to the chiefe Priest of the Jewes, for hee is called the Angel of the Lord of Hosts, as the person from whom the Law was to be derived to the people. Furthermore these Angels in that vision of Johns are likened to so many Starres, which, seeing Christ is said to beare or carry in his Right-hand Apoc. 1. 16. 20. & 1. 2. an argument of competent validity may be drawne from thence, that this dignity and power of them in the Church is, if not immediately instituted, yet approved and confirmed by Christ; especially when in these so many parts of this Epistle, Christ himselfe hath written to every of;

of them under this title of honour and dignity. In the presence of so much light that some Men should still continue blind is to be numbred among the prodigies of this worst and most unhappy age. For as to that which from the one word [you] in the plural. c. 4. 24. I finde objected by some against so many single mentions of the Angels (one in every Church) that will immediately vanish, &c.

5. These words thus intirely set downe have a face very distant from that so much confidence and *consorsionnesse* that I am here charged with by the *Provinciall Synod*. For 1. For the conclusion deduced from the mention of these *Angles*, 'tis not the *Divine Right of Prelacy* (which phrase might yet have beene reconciled with rules of Sobriety and Modesty, as well as the *Jus Divinum* of Presbytery) but Christs approbation and confirmation of this dignity and power of Bishops, which conclusion hath evident grounds in those Texts which mention *Christs holding them in his Hand*, and his addressing an *Epistle* to them, supposing onely, what is undertaken to be evidenced by other *mediums*, that these Angels were single persons in each Church.

6. Secondly, that which is by me so confidently affirmed, is not, as this learned *Assembly* is pleased to suggest, that these Angels were Metropolitans or Archbishops. That they were such, is afterwards as a distinct matter in the next Chapter proposed in a much more moderate style, *statim credibile fiet*, it will straitwayes become credible, and with no more shew of confidence then the premises which are there at large set down, will Authorize.

7. These be two competent essayes to begin with, by which we may proportion our expectations; But there is yet a third which hath somewhat more of *injustice* in it, to mention my so much confidence in asserting, but never to take notice of the grounds produced, whereon this confidence (as farre as it extends) is built, the want of which is so constantly the one thing, which renders confidence unreasonable or blameable, that it is not in the power of any man to have apprehended grounds as proper to induce a conclusion, and to suspend the *beliefe* and confidence of the truth of that conclu-

tion, which is so inferred. The *in iustice*, I say, is there not taking notice of the *mediums*, whereon the *confidence* is founded, very competent to inferre a conclusion in that stile, wherein it was there inferred, if they had been pleased to advertise their Readers of it.

8. The inference lies thus; The *Angel* of each Church of *Asia* was a *single* person, therefore not a *Colledge* or *Consistory* of *Presbyters*, and the singularity of the person is there supposed to be evidenced sufficiently by that which is so many times repeated in the *Text*, the *Angel* of the Church of *Ephesus*, the *Angel* of the Church of *Smyrna*, and the like, by the testimony of *Andreas Casariensis*, the Principall Annotator or Interpreter of the *Revelation*, transcribed by *Aretas* in expresse words, ἐπὶ αὐτῶν τῶν ἐκκλησιῶν ἰσαριθμοὶ ἄγγελοι, the number of the Bishops equall to the number of the Churches; and by the answer rendred to that one *Objection* which is brought by the *Presbyterians* against the singularity of the person of each *Angel*.

9. Secondly, this singular person was a *Bishop* in that notion of the word which signifies a precedence of power and dignity over all others in that Church. This againe was made evident, both by the forementioned singularity of his power and person in each Church, and farther by the propriety of the title bestowed on him, an *Angel*, such as among the *Jewes* the chiefe Priest was styled; *Adalac. 2.* to which matter I shall now superadde one Testimony which *Photinus* hath out of *Diodorus Siculus* concerning the *Jewes*; Ἀρχιερεὺς τὸν περὶ τὰς πόλιν, ὃν νομίζουσιν αὐτοῖς ἄγγελον γενέσθαι τῶν τῷ θεῷ περὶ τὰς πόλιν, Him they call the High Priest, and deeme him to be to them an Angel or Messenger of the commands of God (a Commissioner of Heaven, impowered from thence for the execution of his Office among them.)

10. This by the way, gives us the reason of the denomination, because as *Angels* doe not onely carry up our *Prayers* to God, but also bring downe Gods Commands to us, so did the *High-priest* under the Law. This *dialect* is also said to be derived from the *Hebrewes* to the *Egyptians*, who call their chiefe Priest *Angel* also. And then how fitly the parallel runs.

runs betwixt the *Higb Priest* among the *Jewes*, and the *Bishop* in the *Christian Church*, taken in the *Prelatists* notion of him, was a theme which seemed not to need any length of *harangue* to performe or illustrate it. And yet after a *Section* spent to cleare that one difficulty of the [ὅμιν, γομ, in the plurall c. 2. 24.] there are two *Sections* added more for the farther fortifying of this evidence. 1. From the Councell of *Chalcedon*; *Act*. 2. which * from *Timothy* till the time of their *Session* numbers 27. *Bishops* in one of these *Sees*, that of *Ephesus*, also ordeined there (and *Timothy* we know being ordeined by the laying on of *St. Pauls* hands 2 *Tim*. 1. 6. will divolve it to that *Originall*, *Apostoliack* institution) and 2. from *Polycrates*, † who was † *De Martyr*. borne soone after *St. Johns* dayes, and is a witness of a competent antiquity, and affirmes himselfe to be the * eight *Bishop* of that *See*; From both which testimonies of the *Catalogue*, and number of *Bishops*, ascending to *St. Timothy*. as the first of that ranke (who certainly was constituted there before the *Epistle* of *Christ* to the *Angel* of that *Church*) the conclusion is obvious and irrefragable, that either *Timothy* or some *successor* of his was personally the *Angel* to which the *Epistle* was addrest, and I professe not to wish for a greater evidence to justify a *Prelatist* in his desire to live in obedience to that order so signally confirmed by *Christ*.

11. The like is in the next *Section* produced out of *Irenaeus* l. 3. c. 3. concerning the *Angel* of the *Church* of *Smyrna*. *Irenaeus* lived in the time of *Polycarp* that antient *Primitive Martyr*, and being a youth had the honour to see that venerable old Man, and of him he affirmes, that he was * not only a *Disciple* of the *Apostles*, and conversed with many that saw *Christ*, but that also hee was sent to *Asia*, and constituted *Bishop* in the *Church* of *Smyrna*; And if there needed any more light after so cleare and authentick a testimony (which againe concludes either *Polycarpe*, or some *successor* of his to be the *Angel* of the *Church* of *Smyrna* to whom.

* ὅτι τὸ ἀγίον Τιμοθέου μετὰ τὴν καὶ ἐπίσκοπος ἐγένοντο πάντες ἐπὶ τὴν ἐκκλησίαν τὴν ἐν ἐφῆσου.

† De Martyr. Timoth.

* Ep ad. victor. ap. Iacob. Ecol. Hist. l. 5. c. 25.

* ὁ μὲν γὰρ ὑπὸ Ἀποστόλων μαθητὴς Ἰουδῆς καὶ συναναστὰς ἐκείνη τοιαύτης τοῖς τὸν χεῖρ ἐν ἐνδοκίῃ, ἀλλὰ καὶ ὑπὸ Ἀποστόλων καλεσθέντα εἰς τὴν Ἀσίαν ἐν τῇ ἐν Σμυρνῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ ἐπίσκοπος.

Christ addresseth his *Epistle*) there is another added out of *Tertullian*, a Writer of great *Antiquity* and reputation for knowledge in the *Records* of the *Church* in these words.

* Sicut Smyrthæorum Ecclesia Polycarpum à Johanne collocatum refert, sicut Romano: um Clementem à Petro ordinatum edit, perinde utique & ceteræ exhibent, quoniam ab Apostolis in Episcopatû constitutos, Apostolici seminis traductus habens. De Prascrip c: 32.

them. And more

* Habemus Johannis alumnos Ecclesiæ — Ordo Episcoporum ad originem recensua in Johanne flabit auctorem. Adv. Ma. c. 1.4. c. 5.

* As the Church of Smyrna relates Polycarpe to have beene constituted there by John, as the Church of Rome affirms Clement to have beene ordained by Peter, so in like manner the rest of the Churches exhibit the Records of those whom they have had their Bishops constituted by the Apostles and conveyers of the Apostolicall seed to particularly of the Churches of Asia, the subject of our present discourse. * We have the Churches fed by John, and the course of Bishops being driven to the Originall, acknowledge John (the Apostle) to be the Author of them. Here certainly is light

enough to make some confidence excusable in a Prelatist, and to make his Wonder seasonable, that any that have eyes, should in so cleare a *Sunshine* want the use of them, and to thinke it no very *auspicious omen* that they doe. Yet because I had much rather assist, then upbraid other mens infirmities, I have here given them an instance how easie it had been for them to have informed themselves and their respective charges of the grounds of the Prelatists confidence, that the *Epistle* of *Christ* to the *Angels* of the seven *Asian* Churches was an evidence of his approbation of the Order of Bishops in our moderne notion of that word for a single overseer in every Church.

12. And if there be any obscurity still remaining in the premises, because the Councell of *Chalcedon* (and *Policrates*) makes *Timothy*, who was ordained by *Paul* the first Bishop or Angel of the Church of *Ephesus*, but *Tertullian* divolves the Originall of the course or Catalogue to *St John*, the answer is easy, that there were two sorts of Christians in *Ephesus*, and throughout all *Asia*, the first of *Gentile* converts, brought into the faith by *St. Paul* the Apostle of the *Gentiles*, and over them it was that *Timothy* was by him placed in *Ephesus* their

their *Bishop*; the second of *Jewish Profelites* converted by St. John (by compact designed to goe to the *Jewes*, as his Province Gal. 2.9. and those peculiarly the *Asian Jewes*, as appeares every where in * *Eusebius* story, and by the relation of his death in that place, given us by † *Polycrates*, an early *Bishop* there) and the Author of the *constitutions* out of an ancient tradition tells us that another of the same name, Ἰωάννης ὁ ἐκ τῶν Ἰωάννη καρχηδόνιαι) was by that *Apostle* ordained *Bishop* of the *Jewish Christians* there, as *Timothy* by S. *Paul* of the other Congregation of *Geniile Christians*. An observation which is largely educed and exemplified in the * *Dissertations*, and of which there is no small use for the dilucidating of *obscurities* in ancient story, and the clearing of this controversy betwixt us and the *Presbyterians*; but I must not here take liberty to enlarge on it unnecessarily, having been thus farre forced to expatiate somewhat above proportion to the length of their owne period, wherein my confidence and censoriousness were shortly accused, how deservedly, I hope hath now been made manifest.

* τὰς αὐτοῖς
διέπειν ἐκ-
κλησίας 1.3.
23.
† Ibid. c. 3 1.

* Dissert. 4. c. 1.
ὁ 7. 66.

Section II.

Of Timothy, of Onesimus, of Polycarpe.

The next period in their charge against mee runs thus. *It is farther added, that some of the Antient Fathers mention the very men that were the Angels of those Churches. Some say Timothy was Bishop of Ephesus, when John wrote his Epistle to it; Others say Onesimus, others say that Policarpe was Bishop of Smyrna; And from hence they conclude with a great deal of plausibility, that the Angels of the Churches were seven. individual Bishops.* Nuan. 12.

2. Here is as yet no great charge offered, but a confession rather, that I had some temptation for the confidence, of which I was formerly accused, my conclusion being acknowledged by the adversaries to be inferred with a great deal of plausibility. But I have not so much reason to depend on their civilities, as to omit the inserting here, what may be usefull

to

to prevent mistakes, and, shall therefore thinke it necessary to set downe intirely, what it is which I have affirmed in this matter.

3. And 1. I have yet no where said that *Timothy* was Bishop of *Ephesus* when *John* writ this *Epistle* to that Church; My words are expressely otherwise, *Ex quibus patet vel Timotheum ipsum vel aliquem ei succedaneum hunc ipsum Angelum fuisse, quem c.2.1. Christum alloquitur.* By which it appears (having formerly set down my grounds to induce this conclusion) that either *Timothy* himself, or some body that succeeded him, was that very Angel to whom *Christ* address his speech, c.2.1: But that is not to affirme it of *Timothy*, but purposely to abstaine from affirming any thing that could be denyed or doubted, and onely to affirme it either to *Timothy* or some successor of his, which evidently and infallibly it must be, if there be truth in the premise from which it was inferred, the words of the Councell, and the Father, that after *Timothy*, the first, succeeded of continuall series of Bishops there.

4. What my opinion is in this matter, I shall now freely tell them, though before I had not occasion to doe it, together professing it to be onely my opinion, and so still affirming nothing in a matter of some uncertainty, or farther than the grounds, on which my opinion is founded, shall appeare able to support it. My opinion briefly is, that *Timothy* was then Bishop of *Ephesus* at the time of addressing that *Epistle* to the Angel of that Church; And the grounds are these. 1. That *St. Johns* banishment and prophesying are by *Epiphanius* twice expressely affirmed to have been ἐν χρόνῳ Κλαυδίου Καίσαρος, in the times of *Claudius Caesar*; Then secondly, that as it is by *Chronologers* set downe to be in the 13. of *Claudius*, that *Timothy* was left by *Paul* at *Ephesus*, when hee went into *Macedonia*; 1 *Tim.* 1. 3. *Act.* 20. so it is generally resolved that *Timothy* suffered at *Ephesus* under *Nerva*, and that agreeable enough with his age, who appeares to be young when *Paul* first placed him Bishop of *Ephesus*. If these grounds have truth in them, then *Timothy* cannot be doubted to be Bishop of *Ephesus*, when *St. Johns* vision was received; And though 'tis true, that *Irenaeus* seemes to assigne another date of

Her. Ἀλογ.

of these *visions*, at least of some of them, *πρὸς τὸ τέλος Δομιτιανῶς αἰχῆς*, as the end of Domitians Reigne (which what it is to be deemed to signifie, is * elsewhere explained) yet still that is within the compasse of *Timothies* life, if hee suffered not till *Nerva's* Reigae. And so much for that of *Timothies*.

Annus. p. 906.

5. Secondly, that *Onesimus* was Bishop of *Ephesus* at the date of that *Epistle*, is no where so much as intimated to be my opinion, much lesse affirmed by me. And therefore I need reply no more to that. Yet because *Ignatius* in his *Epistle* to the *Ephesians* mentions *Onesimus* their Bishop (and that *Testimony* is produced by me *Dissert. 2. c. 25. Sect. 9.*) I shall here freely give them my opinion also of that matter.

6. First, that there is little ground of *question*, but that one of that name, *Onesimus*, was Bishop of *Ephesus* in the tenth yeare of *Trajan*, wherein *Ignatius* wrote that *Epistle*.

7. Secondly, that by one indication there is some small reason to guess, that this *Onesimus* was then lately come to that dignity; I meane *Ignatius* his words of gratulation to that Church, that God had given them the favour to obtaine or have such a Bishop: *εὐλογητὸς ὁ χαρισάμενος ὑμῖν τοιούτοις ἐσι τοιούτον ἐπίσκοπον κενῶν δα.*

8. Thirdly, that according to *Epiphanius* his setting down the time of *John's* banishment and *visions*, in the dayes of *Claudius*, there must be above 50 yeares distance between the date of this *Epistle* of *Christ*, and that of *Ignatius*, and consequently that it is not so likely that *Onesimus*, that was their Bishop in the later, should be that very *Angel* in the former.

9. Fourthly, that as I can have no cause to consent with *Ado* (in *lib. de Fest. Apost. ad 14. Cal. Mart.*) that this *Onesimus* in *Ignatius* was hee that is mentioned by *St. Paul* to *Philemon*, so nor to adhere to the *Roman Martyrologie*, that he whom *Paul* mentions, was constituted Bishop of *Ephesus* after *Timothy*.

10. And therefore *fifthly*, it must be remembred, that both the *Greeke Menologies*, and *Simeon Metaphrastes* (who celebrate

celebrate his memory on *March 13.*) acknowledge not that *Onesimus* to have been at all *Bishop* of *Ephesus*, and that others also of the *antients* make him to have been *Bishop* of *Beraa*, and martyr'd in *Domitian's* Reigne: and *Dorotheas* in *Synopsi* expressly affirmeth that *Gaius* succeeded *Timothy* in *Ephesus*.

11. From all which it followes, that *Onesimus* mentioned by *Ignatius*, was some later *Bishop* of that *City*, who bare that very *Ordinary* Greeke name, and so that his being *Bishop* of *Ephesus* no way belongs to that time of the *Angel* in the *Revelation*, nor interferences with their opinion, who thinke *Timothy* to have beene that *Angel*; The appearing incompatibility whereof was it, I suppose, that brought in here the mention of *Onesimus*.

12. This was here seasonable enough to be confronted to their words in this place, and will be of use to be remembred in the proesse of their *Discomfite*.

13. Thirdly, for *Polycarp's* being *Bishop* of *Smyrna*, as there is left no place for the doubting of that (if either *Irenaeus*, that lived in his time and saw him, or if *Tertullian*, who lived not long after, and was a curious *Antiquary*, may be believed in their joynt affirmations of a knowne matter of *Fact*) so it is againe no where affirmed by me, that hee was the very man, to whom that *Epistle* to the *Angel* of *Smyrna* was sent, and if that were their meaning, they have againe misreported my words.

14. All that I had said, I thinke was proved irrefragably, that in two of those *Churches* mentioned in the *Apocalyps*, *Timothy* and *Polycarpe* are by *Authenticke testimonies* affirmed to be constituted *Bishops*, the one by *St. Paul*, the other by *St. John*, and that is a competent argument added to others, to inferre that the *Angel* of each of those *Churches* was a single person, and so a *Bishop* in the *Prelatists*, not in the *Presbyterians* notion of the word, an assertion which I need not feare will yeild any advantage to the *adversaries*, and so I as briefly commit it to them.

Section 3.

Of the negative Argument from St. John's not using the word Bishop. Of ἑπισκοπος in the Revelation.

IN the next place by way of answer to this plea of the Prelatists, we are referred to three writings of their party, *Smeftymnnus, the Vindication of Smeftymnnus, the Humble Addreffes of the Divines at the Isle of Wight*, wherein, say they, *these things are fully, clearly, and satisfactorily handled.*

Num. 1.

2. But it being certaine that every one of these three was published some yeares before the *Dissertations*, I should thinke it strange that the particulars there insisted on by me, should by divination be thus answered before their conception, being able truly to professe, that though I am not unwilling to make use of any mans aid for defending truth; yet none of those writings, to which any of those three were given in answer, were by me made use of in those compositions.

3. But we are superseded the trouble of examining any of these three, by the leave that is craved to borrow from them what may be usefull for the turne, and then in like manner I shall more willingly receive from these, what shall appeare to answer, or prejudge our plea, than undertake new troubles in farther unnecessary search of it.

4. First, then they desire it may be considered, that S. John, the Penman of the Revelation doth neither in it, nor in any of his other writings so much as upon the (by; I suppose, for the Printer failes me) name Bishop. Hee names the name Presbyter frequently in the Revelation; yea, when he would set out the office of those who are neereft the throne of Christ in his Church, Rev. 4. he calls himselfe a Presbyter, Ep. 2. And whereas in S. John's dayes some new expressions were used in the Christian Church, which were not in Scripture, as the Christian Sabbath began to be called the Lords day, and Christ himselfe the Word, now both these are found in the writings of St John; And it is strange to us that the Apostle should mention a new phrase, and not mention a new Office erected by this time (as our Brethren say) in the Church, especially if wee consider that Polycarpe

(as is related) was made Bishop by him; And no doubt if hee had been made Bishop in a prelaticall sense, we should have found the name Bishop in some of his writings, who lived so long as to see Episcopacy settled in the Church, as our Adversaries would make us believe.

5. We are now to consider what degree of conviction, or Argument, to the prejudice of our pretensions, can be fetcht from this large consideration. And first it is most evident and notorious among all Artists, that an argument from Authority cannot conclude negatively that there were no Bishops in St John's time, because St. John doth not mention Bishops. It is the same way of arguing, as if they should conclude that there was no God in the time of writing the Canonick Chapters of Hester, because God is not found once mentioned in those Chapters. And yet of this inartificiall kinde is the whole discourse of this Paragraph, the premisses barely negative, throughout all the consideration; And so nothing is concludible from it to the prejudice of us, or benefit of our adversaries.

6. Secondly, all that this consideration pretends to, is terminated in the bare name of Bishop, that is it which they pretend is not to be found in St John. But 1. They knew that the word Angel is oft in St John, and by us contested, by the singularity of the person one Angel in each Church (and other Characters) to conclude the Office of Bishop as irrefragably, as if the word Bishop were there specified. Nay of this wee have a competent experience, that if the word Bishop had been found there, it would by Presbyterians be as readily expounded to signifie a Presbyter, or colledge of such (for so certainly they have done in other places) and truly with as much reason and satisfaction to any impartiall judge, as they have affirmed the word Angel in each Church to denote such. And therefore

7. Thirdly, I shall demand, would the Apostle St. John's using the name Bishop, be at all usefull to the Prelatists interests, to conclude that there was such an Office in the Church in his time; or would it not? If not, then sure it is not to our prejudice, that hee hath not mentioned that name, and then
this

this whole consideration is perfectly to no purpose. If it would, then sure St. Pauls and St. Lukes frequent mentions of them (I may adde St. Peter also) will supply St. John's omissions, and conclude there were Bishops in their time, and that was long before St. Johns death, if it had been considered.

8. Fourthly, when it is said that St. John frequently names the name *Presbyter* in the *Apocalyps*, 'tis not imaginable that they should thinke the *Author* of the *Dissertations* could receive any prejudice from thence, when hee hath avowed to believe that those *Πρεσβύτεροι Elders*, mentioned in those so many places of the *Revelation*, were the 24. Bishops of *Judea* sitting in *Councell* at *Jerusalem* their *Metropolis*, encompassing James the Bishop there together with the foure living creatures, denoting the foure Apostles that were joyned with them in the *councell*, and the 7. *Lanups*, the emblemes of the 7. *Deacons* attending; Of which matter till they have disproved what is commodiously deduced *Dissert. 4. c. 20. Sect. 10.* I shall have no need farther to enlarge, it being perfectly uselesse to our present inquiry, that either the word *Bishop* or *Elder* should be used by St. John, for a single *Presbiter* in the *Christian Church*, supposing (as now we do in the *Objection*, and tis but a begging of the question in the respondent to suppose the contrary) that the word *Angel* is a notation of it.

9. By this it appeares fifthly, how little wee incommodated by the position of these *Elders* in the *Revelation* placed nearest to the throne of *Christ* in his Church, for supposing, as I doe, that *Christ* is by way of vision represented there under the person of the Bishop of *Jerusalem* sitting in *councell*, and encompassed (on each side) with a *Semicircle* of *Thrones*, on which sat the 24 Bishops of *Judea*, I can well allow these 24 (call them *Elders*, or what you please) to be nearest to that middle throne, whereon *Christ* is seated. And truly if it should be otherwise interpreted of *Presbyters* in the *moderne* notion of the word, it would be hard to make the other parts of the vision to beare proportion with that phansy; For I must suppose, according to St. John's words, that in the vision these thrones were set up in *Heaven*; And then I shall demand, was that a representation of any *councell* or *Judicature* on *Earth*,

or not? If it were not, then nothing can be inferred thence in favour of *Presbyters*, more than of *Bishops*, for of both these we speake, as of *Officers* on Earth; But if it were, then applying it to *Presbyters*, it must follow, that in the *midst* of them there is some other (invironed on each side by them) καθήμενος ἐν τῷ θρόνῳ, *sitting upon that throne of principall dignity*, before whom also they on the *other thrones* must fall downe v.10. (or else the *parallel* will not hold throughout) and the least that can be signified hereby, will be *superiority of dignity* in him that sits on that *middle throne* above all the 24. *Elders*, which will be deemed to exceede the case of a *Prolocutor* or *Moderator* of an *Assembly*, which is the utmost that the *Presbyterian* ἰσότης or *equality* can admit of, but much more commodiously agrees to the *Metropolitan* of all *Indea*, sitting in a *Nationall Conneell* with the *Bishops* about him, for of these we doubt not to affirme that they were as much inferior to him, as this *representation* doth pretend them to be.

10. As for the sence affixt to it by the *Assemblers*, that the Πρεσβύτεροι are *Presbyters* in the *moderne* notion, and that he that sits in the *midst* of them is *Christ*, this is against all *analogy*, and rules of interpreting, a raining and confounding the *Originall* with the *Copy*, the *type* with the *Antitype*, interpreting one part of the *vision*, as if it were in *Heaven* (for it was there where *Christ* did sit as *Judge*) and the other as if it were on *Earth*, for sure the *Presbyters* in this notion are to be considered as there; And this is a very sufficient prejudice against their interpretation (if there were not enough besides) and such as no way presseth our way of setting it, as hath been already manifested.

11. Sixtly, for his calling himselfe a *Presbyter* Ep. 2. I answer, that as farre as this allegation hath truth, it hath no force in it at all against our pretensions. He doth indeed call himselfe ὁ πρεσβύτερος (the *Elder*, we fitly render it) noting thereby (according to *analogy* with the solemne notion of the word both among *sacred* and *prophane* Writers, set downe at large *Dissert.* 4. c. 19.) a person of *authority* in the *Church of Christ*; an *Apostle* first, and then the *supreme Governour* of the

the whole *Jewish Church* in *Asia*, which is but proportionable to *Saint Pauls* beginning his *Epistles* with *Paul an Apostle* (or *Commissioner*) of *Jesus Christ* (placed in that power in the *Church* by *Christ* himselfe) and with the same style in the front of *Saint Peters Epistles*, onely with this *Characteristick* note peculiar to *Saint Iohn* in his *Gospell* and *Epistles*, of omitting the expression of his owne name; And then all that this text is of force to doe, is to prove that the word Πρεσβύτερος doth not import a *Presbyter* (in our *moderne* use of the word) governing in *common* with other *Presbyters*, but rather a *singular Governor* of the *Church*, such as *Bishops* are by us contested to be; And so the *Greek Scholiasts* have expressed it, ἐπισκοπον εαυτὸν καλῶν διὰ τῶ Πρεσβυτέρου, By the word *Elder* he calls himselfe *Bishop*. And this, 'tis certaine, is for the interest of the *Author* of the *Dissertations*, and no way to his prejudice, if it had been adverted by them that produce it.

12. *Seventhly*, when 'tis said that in *Saint Iohn's* dayes some *New expressions* were used in the *Christian Church*, which were not in *Scripture*, as the *Lords day*, and the *Word*, I professe not to comprehend what advantage to their pretensions could be designed or aimed at in this part of the consideration: For 1. how can it truly be said, that the word Κυριακή, *Lord's day*, which is in the *Revelation*, and ὁ Λόγος, the *Word*, which is in *Saint Iohn's Gospell*, were not in *Scripture*? I must suppose the meaning is, that they were not in any other writings of *Scripture*, except *Saint Iohn's*: But then 2. that doth not infer them to be *new expressions* in *Saint Iohn's* dayes, as these dayes are distinguished from the dayes of the other *Apostles*, whom *Iohn* survived, but only that they were *idiomes* or *characters* of speech that *Saint Iohn* delighted to make use of.

13. Thus indeed 'tis ordinarily observed of his expressing of *Christ* by ὁ Λόγος the *word*, which yet is taken from the *Ancients* of the *Jewish Church* (the *Chaldes* paraphrase being knowne frequently to use כִּימָרָא the word of the *Lord*, and *Plato* seems to have been acquainted with the expression, which caused *Amelius* to sweare at the reading the beginning of

* In Pandect.
pag. 39.

of *S. John's Gospel*, that that *Barbarian* was of their *Plato's* mind, that the word of *God* was in order of a *Principle* and perhaps not peculiarly to him appropriate, for * *Bradaus* a very learned *Critic* in *Greek* affirms *Saint Luke* to have used it in this notion, cap. 1. 2. and if he doth not, yet still 'twill be but a peculiar part of *Saint John's* style, which if he had written his *Gospel* in the same yeare that *Saint Matthew* did his, he would doubtlesse have made use of, the phrase being certainly in the world before that time (and so not new, as they would have it) and the usage of it in the Church being in all reason to be derived from *Saint John's* use of it (who was from thence called *Θεολογος* the *Divine*) not *Saint John's* use of it from the new admission of it into the *Christian Church*.

14. And for the word *Κυριακή*, *Lord's day*, as it is not certaine that it is the *Christian Sabbath* (I meane the *Weekly Lord's day*), which is meant by that title once used in the *Revelation*, but as probably the *feast of Easter*, the annual commemoration of *Christ's* rising from the dead (and accordingly *Andreas Casariensis* sets it indifferently, yet so as it seems rather to incline to the later, *Κυριακή τῆς ἀναστάσεως χριστοῦ μνημόσυνον ἡμέραν*, the *Lord's day* bearing the memorial of the resurrection of *Christ*) so in what notion soever it be taken, it was against *Saint John's* use of the word that gave it authority in the following dialect of the Church, not the Churches usage (that we any where can discern) from whence *Saint John* derived it; And so this will be an instance as ineffectual as the former, to inferre the conclusion to which it is designed: For indeed bating the unskilfulnesse of the argument, ab authoritate negative, already mentioned, what a strange way of concluding would this be? *S. John* useth the words [*ὁ Λόγος*, the word] and [*Κυριακή*, *Lord's day*] (supposing also, that 'tis true which is added) and no other writer of the Scripture useth them but in stead of them, [*the Sonne o' God*] (*Messias*, *Christ*) and the [*first day of the week*] therefore if there had been any office of *Bishops* erected in the Church in *Saint John's* time, it is strange that *Saint John* should not mention the name *Ἐπίσκοπος* *Bishop*: 'Tis at the first hearing cleare enough

nough, that there is no *strangeness* in this, both because Saint John undertooke not to set downe a *Dictionary* of all words or customes which were in his time in the Church, and because there is no proportion held betwixt the members of the *comparison*, as hath been shewed. And it will yet be lesse strange, because 1. it is easily supposeable and not strange, that he should have no occasion at all to mention that office, or that mentioning it, he should doe it in his owne chosen expression, Ἄγγελος *Angel*, or πρεσβύτερος, *Elder* (as in other greater matters he is acknowledged and allowed to doe) by either of those signifying the same thing as expressly as the using of Ἐπίσκοπος *Bishop* would have done: And 2. it is otherwise as manifest by Saint Paul and Saint Luke, that the word Ἐπίσκοπος *Bishop*, and the office belonging to it were before the time of Saint John's writings used in the Church, as it could be, if Saint John had made expresse mention of it.

15. And lastly, for the highest round in the καίμαξ, the special part of the *consideration*, our affirmation that Polycarp was made *Bishop* by Saint John, that doth not (any more than all the rest) inferre it necessary that Saint John should mention the name *Bishop*: Saint Iude, I hope, is supposed by the *Assemblers* to have constituted some *Presbyters* in the Church, and yet he in his *Epistle* hath made no mention of any such name or office. And so much for that first *consideration*.

Section I V.

Of Saint John's writings. Againe of Diotrephes.

A Second *consideration* now followes to be added to this, Num. 1. That there is not any the least intimation in all S. John's writings, of the superiority of one *Presbyter* over another, save onely where he names and chides Diotrephes, as one ambitiously affecting such a *Primacy*.

2. A *consideration* of the same unhappy constitution with the former, 1. a *testimonio negative* againe, Saint John had no occasion to mention it, therefore there was in his time no

E

such

such thing, and 2. in respect of the matter just the same againe, put only in other words; there 'twas, [No mention of *Bishop* in all Saint *John's* writings,] here, [No *superiority* of one *Presbyter* over another in all Saint *John's* writings] And so it can adde no accumulation of weight to the former,

3. But then 2. (bating againe those two infirmities in discourse) what if it were granted that at the time of Saint *John's* writing, there were not in the whole Church of *Christ* any one *Presbyter*, superior to another *Presbyter*, what hath the *Author* of the *Dissert*: lost, or they gained by this? He makes no doubt willingly to yeild to any inforcing reason that is or shall be produced to conclude that at that time, there was above *Deacons* but one degree in the Church, and yet to be never the lesse qualified to maintaine his pretensions, Nay he is knowne to have expressed it as his opinion probably inferred, and not easily confuted (and that by which, if it be true, or because there is no evidence to the contrary, all the *Presbyterian*. pretensions, founded in the doubtfulnessse of words in *Scripture*, are utterly excluded) that there were not in the space within compasse of which, all the *Bookes* of the *New Testament* were written, any *Presbyters* in our *Moderne* notion of them, created in the Church, though soon after, certainly in *Ignatius's* time, there were; and then if the consideration now before us were of any force at all, this would be the one direct and proper use of it, to adde more confidence to this opinion, and so to confirme, not to invalidate our pretensions.

4. Thirdly for *Diotrephes* and Saint *John's* chiding of him for ambitiously affecting a *Primacy* over other *Presbyters*, there will appeare to be more than one misadventure in it. For 1. it is apparent in the *Text* that this *Diotrephes* (whom * *Wals* *Messatimus* a good friend to the pretensions of the *Assemblers*, describes so, as will conclude him a meere *Presbyterian*, *Nobis*, saith he, *agnoscere superiorem aliquem in Presbyteros habentem potestatem, he would not acknowledge any superior having power over Presbyters*) contended for superiority, not onely over his equals, but over Saint *John* himselfe, in *Malactas* *huit*, saith that *Apostle*, he receiveth not us, yeilds

yields no obedience, gives no heed to our letter of directions; This certainly belongs not to the superiority or dignity of Bishops, which reserves the Primacy to the Apostles intire, and no way clasheth with it, and onely pretends to that power and office of duty, which for the preserving of unity, and the good of the flock, the Apostles thought fit to intrust and commit to them.

5. Secondly, *Diotrephes* was not (as farre as appeares, or we have reason to conjecture) ordeined to any office of power in the Asian Church, committed to that Apostles care, but of himselfe without any mission, nay expressly against the Apostles consent, was willing to assume and exercise this power, and is but an example of *Corah's* sedition and presumptuous humour (and that is inevitably the case of the Presbyterian, unlesse he can shew his commission for the power he pretends to) all one with that of the *Gnosticks* censured by Saint Jude under the style of ἀντιλογία Χρὲς the gaine-saying of *Corah*, and this no way belongs, or is appliable to the practice of the Bishop, who by Commission from the Apostle, not by any ambition or presumption of his owne, regularly ascends to this degree of office and dignity in the Church, and useth it as regularly also, in subordination to all his superiors.

6. On this Occasion the *Dissertations* have offered a Dilemma to these Disputants, which I should be willing to heare answered by them, in this forme, Either *Diotrephes* exercised in the Church the power of the Bishop, in the notion of a singular *Præfekt*, assuming power over the Presbyters, or he did not; If he did not, then is this consideration presently at an end, *Diotrephes* is fallly accused, and the innocent Bishop unjustly wounded through his sides, who it seems was no Bishop: But if it be said he did, then I demand, Why is not *Diotrephes* checked by S. John for that presumption of affecting a power over his equals? And why doth the whole charge lye another way, that he received not S. John's Letters, nor paid due obedience to them? Or why is that very thing charged so heavily on the Bishops in our age, and punished so severely in them, which the Apostle living and seeing, and upon occasion taking notice of *Diotrephes* his insolence, doth not so much as reprehend or accuse in him?

7. For as to the *Epithet* which he bestowes upon him, that he was φιλοπρωτεύων, one that loved the *præminence*, supposing that were the title of his fault, yet that extends not the *Apostles* speech to censuring or blaming the use of that power, but onely the *ambition* and affectation of it, which were otherwise lawfull to be enjoy'd; as when tis noted in the *Pharisees*, that they did φιλεῖν πρωτοκαθεδρίας, love or affect the uppermost seats in the *Synagogues*, which otherwise simply to have sat in, had implied no crime of theirs, for to this very end, that some body should sit in them, they were certainly erected, and tis known that there was among them a ראש הקהל head of the Consistory, an ἀρχισυνάγωγος & Governor of the *Synagogue*, to whom that seat belonged by God's appointment.

8. Nay for the very desire, as farre as is exprest by ἐρέγεται or ἐπιθυμῶν 1 Tim. 3. 1. desiring and coveting, it is allowed by the *Apostle* to be terminated in ἐπισκοπή the office of a Bishop, καλὸν ἔργον, as a good, and consequently a desirable worke, and if *Diotrephes* be supposed guilty of any other, it may safely be yeilded to have been a fault in him, without præjudice to the good office which he so vitiously and criminously affected, according to that of * *Theodoret*, that the *Apostle*, ἐκ ἀπλῶς τῆς ἐπιθυμίας, ἀλλὰ τῆς φιλαρχίας καὶ ἰσχυροῦς, accuses not the desire simply, but the desire of rule, καὶ διδάσκει μὴ τιμῆς ἀλλ' ἀρετῆς ἐρέγεται, μὴ τῷ ἀξίᾳ ποθεῖν, ἀλλὰ τῆς ἀξίας τὸ ἔργον ἐπιζητεῖν, and teacheth to desire, not the honour, but the vertue, not to covet the dignity, but to seeke the worke of the dignity, the taske to which it belongs. By all which, and much more added in the

* In 1 Tim. 3. 1

* Dissert. 1. cap. 13.

* *Dissertations*, it is evident, how little advantage hath accrued to the *Assemblers* from their mention of *Diotrephes* out of Saint *John*, and by consequence from their second consideration.

Section V.

Of St. John's being Bishop of Asia. Of the Apostles
being Bishops.

Numb. 1.

NOW succeeds a third consideration. viz. That the same Authors that say that S. John made Polycarpe Bishop of Smyrna, & that S. Peter made Ignatius Bishop of Antioch, do also say that St. John himselfe sat many yeares Bishop of Ephesus, and was the Metropolitan of all Asia, which (say they) is an evident demonstration to us, that these Authors did not use the word Bishop in a Prelaticall sense. For it is certaine that the Apostles cannot be properly called Bishops; For though they doe eminently containe the Episcopall Office, yet they were not formally Bishops. For this were to degrade the Apostles, and to make their Office Ordinary and perpetuall, this were to exalt the Bishop above his degree, and make him an Apostle, and to make the Apostle a Bishop. It doth not much differ from madnesse, to say that Peter or any one of the Apostles were properly Bishops, as learned Whitaker saith, whom wee shall have occasion to cite to this purpose hereafter.

2. Whether this consideration be likely to contribute any thing to their advantage, save onely by amusing the Reader, and keeping him longer in expectation, that somewhat may possibly be produced to the disparagement of our plea, I desire may distinctly be considered by these degrees.

3. First, I acknowledge that stile [the same Authors—] to belong truly to antient Writers produced by mee in the Dissertations, who, as they doe affirme St. John to have constituted Polycarpe Bishop of Smyrna, Diss. 4. c. 5. Sect. 5. and St. Peter to have placed Ignatius Bishop of Antioch: Diss. 5. c. 1. Sect. 18. so they consent also that St. John sat Bishop of Ephesus and Metropolitan of all Asia: so * Eusebius frequently, that after his returne from his banishment τὰς ἐκκλησίας διέτεν ἐκκλησίας, he administred or governed the Churches there, i.e. in Asia; and (as he cites it lib. 3. cap. 31. out of Policratus his Epistle) died there. So the antient Writer of the Martyrdom of Timothy, τὴν Φωτίου ἐν ὁρίματι Νεββά τῆς Ἰερουσαλὴμ ἐκκλησίας ἀπακλῆναι τῇ Ἐπιστολῇ καὶ τῇ Μυστηρίῳ καὶ αὐτοῦς διὰ τὴν αὐτῆς ἐπὶ τῆς Asia Num. 259.

* L. 3 c. 23.

† Biblioth.

συμπαρόντων ἐπισκόπων τῆς ἑφεσίων ἀντιλαμβάνεται Μητροπόλεως, Being recalled by Nerva's decree, he sat downe at Ephesus, and himselfe personally, with seven Bishops his adessors (those in all probability the Bishops of the seven Churches in the Revelation) hee governed the Metropolitan City of Ephesus that prime, Metropolis of all Asia, to the Bishop whereof, saith † Chrysostome, was intrusted ἡ ὅλη ἐκκλησία τῆς Ἀσίας, the whole *Nation* of Asia; These testimonies may suffice for the substance of the affirmation that St. John governed the Church of Ephesus, and under it all Asia, which is the notion wee now have of a Bishop Metropolitane and Primate.

4. As for the word *Bishop*, how can it be inconvenient to bestow that upon him, when hee discharged the Office, nay when Christ himselfe that great exemplar and originall of this power, is expressly called the Bishop of our Soules, as well as the Apostle; when the Office from which *Indas* fell, and so which *Matthias* is assumed, is by St. Luke out of the Septuagint called ἐπισκοπή Bishoprick, Act. 1. 20. When accordingly from the Scripture usage the Fathers of the Church have continued the stile, *Apostolos* i.e. *Episcopus* & *Præpositus Dominus* elegit, the Lord chose Apostles, i.e. Bishops and Governours of the Church, saith * Cyprian, and ἐν Ρώμῃ γερῶνασι πρῶτοι Πέτρος καὶ Παῦλος οἱ Ἀπόστολοι αὐτοὶ καὶ ἐπίσκοποι, Peter and Paul were the first or chiefe in Rome, the same persons, Apostles and Bishops, saith * Epiphanius, and Apostoli Episcopi sunt, firmante illud Petro Apostolo—the Apostles were Bishops, as is confirmed by Peter in these words. His Bishoprick let another take, saith † Hilarinus Sardus, and againe, Archall Apostles? 'Tis true, saith hee, quia in Ecclesiâ unus Episcopus, because in each Church there is one Bishop. And, Nemo ignorat Episcopos servatorem Ecclesiis instituisse, Ipse enim priusquam ascenderet, imponens manuum Apostolis ordinavit eos Episcopos. No man is ignorant that our Saviour instituted Bishops in the Church, for before he ascended to Heaven hee laid his hands on the Disciples and ordained them Bishops; saith the * Writer of the questions on the Old and New Testament, and, Sanctus *Matthæus* Episcopatum sortitus est, St. Matthew was Bishop, saith

† Hom. 15. in
1 Tim. 5. 19.

* Ep. 65.

* L. 1. Cont.
Carpoc.

† In Eph. 4. &
1 Cor. 12. 29.

* Quest. 97.

saith *Gildas*. And to shut up all, *καταδείκνυσι ὅτι οἱ Ἀπόστολοι*
ἦσαν ἐπίσκοποι—It is manifest that the Apostles were Bishops,
St. John in Asia, St. Andrew in Achaia, St. Thomas in India;
 saith * *Gabriel Philadelph*: And agreeably when *St. John* of
 whom we now speake, calls himselfe in the front of two E-
 pistles ὁ πρεσβύτερος, the Elder, the Greek scholiast, resolves
ἐπίσκοπον αὐτὸν καλεῖ διὰ τὸ πρεσβύτερον, by the word Elder he
 calls himselfe Bishop. And so there is no newes in thus af-
 firming.

Ἐν τῇς β'
 διαρ.

5. But then secondly, when they take this for an evident
 demonstration, that these Authors did not use the word Bishop
 in a Prelaticall sense, this is very farre distant from a demon-
 stration, having not arrived to the lowest degree of probability
 or credibility. For what is a Bishop in the Prelaticall sense,
 but a single person governing in chiefe in a City or wider cir-
 cuit? And such certainly was *St. Peter* at *Rome*, *S. John* at
Ephesus, &c. As long as they continued to execute that power
 of the Keyes (the donation of which intituled them
ἐκκλησιαστικοὶ Stewards in Gods House, Governours of the Church)
 in this or that City or Region, and ordained other Bishops
 there.

Thirdly, therefore when 'tis added, that it is certaine that
 the Apostles cannot be properly called Bishops, I reply, that it
 is most certaine they may, not onely because these so many
 antient Writers, through severall ages have called them so,
 and may not, with any justice from us, be accused of impro-
 priety, but because the donation of the Keyes did as properly
 make them Bishops, as the Commission to goe preach to all
 Nations, being added to it, made them Apostles. To which
 purpose let these few things be considered, 1. That it is here
 by the Assemblies acknowledged, that the Apostles did emi-
 nently containe the Episcopall Office, which though it be a
 little hastily expressed, and should be, I suppose, that the
 Apostolicall Office did eminently containe the Episcopall, yet
 there is no doubt, but this is the meaning of it, that the A-
 postles had all the Episcopall power in their hands, and oyer
 and above, something more, and if they had Episcopall power,
 then sure in respect of that, they may as properly be called

Bi-

Bishops, as in respect of their *Apostolicall Commission*, which they had also, they may be properly called *Apostles*. Thus we know that they that have first the power of *Deacons* bestowed on them, and after of *Presbyters*, are questionlesse *Deacons* still, though they be also *Presbyters*, and they which from the *Office* of *Presbyters* are advanced to *Bishops*, are certainly *Presbyters* still, though they be also *Bishops*, and doe not lose the former power by being advanced to the latter, are not lessened by this increase of their dignity.

7. Secondly, that when an *Apostle* is differenced from a *Bishop*, it is either by his extraordinary power granted him for the planting of the *Church*, or by the *Universality* of his *Diocese*, the [all the World] to which his *Commission* extended, whereas the ordinary *Bishop's* power and *Diocese* are more limited. But then these differences are of no force in this matter, they onely conclude that the *Apostle* is more than a *Bishop* in those two respects, not that in other sufficient respects he is not a *Bishop*.

8. Thirdly, when the *Apostles* had each of them (not onely all together in a *consistory*) that unlimited power, in respect of the extent to all the World, given to them by *Christ*, we know that after his *ascent* they parted and distributed this *Province* among them, assigned every one ἰδίον τόπον, or κληρὸν his proper place or lot, to which he should betake himselfe for the planting of the faith of *Christ*; And then there will be no doubt but that hee, who according to his line (in *St. Paul's* phrase) had planted the faith in such a *City* or *Province*, and sat downe, and confirmed, and farther instituted (which is the meaning of *labouring in the Doctrine*, as well as in the word) and govern'd them, and exercised all *Episcopall* acts among them, might in so doing be stiled a *Bishop* in that *City* or *province*, and that as truly and as properly as he that could doe all the latter and not the former (building on another mans foundation, governing and instructing, where another had planted the faith) might be said to be.

9. Nay fourthly, we know, that although by *Canons* of the *Church* there is provision made, upon prudentiall considerations, that no man shall be made a *Bishop sine titulo*, without

a title or particular See, to which hee is assigned, yet before those *Canons* forbad it, such *Bishops* there were, and those never doubted to be properly *Bishops*, though they were not affixt to any *Diocese*; And then nothing can hinder but that the *Apostle*, who had each the whole *World* for his *Title*, though hee were never affixed to any particular *Diocese* or *Province*, might be most properly styled a *Bishop* for all that. But this is *ex abundanti*, more than is needfull to our present pretentions of St. *John*, who, we know, was after his retorne from banishment affixt to *Asia*, and seated at *Ephesus* the chiefe *Metropolis* there, to *superintend* in the Jewish part of the *Asian Church* over all the *Bishops* and *Metropolitans* there.

10. To this I might adde fiftly, that the *Bishops* in every *City* were *successors* of the *Apostles*, as is largely deduced *Diff. 3. c. 3. Sect. 14. &c.* which they could not truly be, if the *Apostles*, whom they *succeeded*, were not in vested with that power, wherein they *succeeded* them, i.e. were not first *Bishops* before them. But I shall not enlarge of this, having no need of more evidences in this matter.

11. Fourthly therefore, when it is added, that if the *Apostles* be affirmed to be properly *Bishops*, this were to degrade the *Apostles*, and to make their office ordinary and perpetuall. This is but a shortnesse of discourse, of which a very few words will suffice to admonish any, for there is no more strength in that consequence, than there would be in affirming that such an one is a *Man*, therefore he is not a *living Creature*, or that he that saith he is a *living Creature*, degrades him from being a *man*; For as to that of [ordinary and perpetuall] 'tis no way inconvenient, that the *Apostles*, who had somewhat temporary and extraordinary for the first planting of Churches (in respect of which especially they were called *Apostles*) might also have somewhat, which was of ordinary perpetuall use in the *Church*, wherein others might and should succeed them, and that is it unquestionably which wee meane by the word *Bishops*, when we ascribe it to them or any of them, or to *Christ* himselfe, the source and originall Copy of that power in the *Church*.

12. Fifthly, when another inconvenience is accumulated on this, (much to the former purpose, but in more words) *this were to exalt the Bishop above his degree, and make him an Apostle, and to make the Apostle a Bishop.* 1. It is evident, that if the forementioned *exception* were true, *viz.* That it were the *degrading* the *Apostle*, it could not farther be truly said, that it were the *exalting* the *Bishop above his degree*, for supposing one to be above the other, the *degrading* one would make the other *equal* to him without any new act of exalting him; if the *Apostle* have already *descended* to the *Bishop*, sure the *Bishop* need not, cannot *ascend* to the *Apostle*; I cannot goe up staires to him who hath prevented me by his *dignation* or *misfortune*, and is already *come* or *fallen downe* to me. Secondly therefore, this makes not the *Bishop* an *Apostle*, which is a degree higher than he, (though in respect of the *Episcopall* power common to them with the *Apostles* it is nothing strange in the *Ancient Writers* for the first *Bishops* of the Churches; *James* the *Bishop* of *Jerusalem*, *Thaddaeus*, *Luke*, *Barnabas*, *Marke*, *Timothy*, *Titus*, *Clemens*, *Ignatius*, to be called *Apostles*, as is evidenced at large in the * *Dissertations*) but onely supposes the *Apostle* to be a *Bishop*, which he may well be (as the *greater* containeth the *lesse*) though the *Bishop* be no *Apostle*, as it is confest that the *lesse* containes not the *greater*.

* Diss 4. c. 3.

13. And lastly for the citation out of Dr. *Whitaker*, I have no directions to the place, which may inable me to examine it; And I know *circumstances* of the *context*, or the *designe* of the speech may much alter it, from what it signifies to me at my reading it thus cited; But if it be distinctly thus, and incapable of a more *conmodious* interpretation, I cannot consent to the truth of it, or comprehend upon what grounds of reason he should so severely censure those *Scriptures* and *Fathers*, which have been produced to affirme that the *Apostles* were *Bishops*, and particularly *St. John* and *St. Peter*. And indeed when it falls out, that each of those two *Apostles* peculiarly calls himselfe *Ἠγούμενος* an *Elder*, or as they render it *Presbyter*, I shall demand; Did either of those speake properly or no? If they did, were either of those *little distant from*
mad-men?

mad-men ? If so I shall be content to be under any *censure* in their *company*. And therefore if they spake not so *properly*, I shall be content with them to have spoken *improperly* also : But if *Apostles* may be called *Presbyters* without any of these inconveniences of *degradation* in them, any *insolence* in the *Presbyter*, or *madnesse* in the *Speaker*, my onely remaining *Quare* is, why they might not, without all this adoe, be called *Bishops* also, meaning by *Bishops*, as I now meane ? For I am sure that is the same thing that I understand by *πρεσβυτερος*, Elder in those three places, and they, who differ from me herein, do yet understand it of *Presbyters* (and so had said in the second *consideration* expressly, that St. *John* calls himselfe a *Presbyter*) and then all the spice of *madnesse* consists in this, thinking a *Bishop* capable of that *exaltation* ; that a *Presbyter* in perfect *sobriety* is capable of. And so much for the third *consideration*.

Section VI.

Of the word *Angel*, and *Starre*, pretended to be common to all *Ministers*. O *Messenger* and *Embassadour*. The singularity of the word *Angel*.

THE fourth consideration is, That the word *Angel* (which is Numb. 1. the title given to those supposed Bishops) doth not import any peculiar jurisdiction, or preeminence, but is a common name to all Ministers, and so is used in Scripture. For all Ministers are Gods Messengers and Embassadours sent for the good of the elect, and therefore the name being common to all Ministers, why should we thinke that there should be any thing spoken to one Minister, that doth not belong to all ? The same may be said of the word *Starre* (which is also a title given to those supposed Metropolitans) It is evident that all faithfull Ministers are called *Starres* in Scripture, whose duty is to shine as lights unto the Churches in all purity of Doctrine, and holinesse of conversation ; There is nothing in these titles that argue these Ministers to be Bishops in our brethrens sense : Inasmuch as had they not been called Bishops by some authors that succeeded them, (who spake

of former times in the language of their owne times) this way of arguing would have been counted ridiculous.

2. To this consideration I might, if it were needfull, reply, 1. That the word *Angel* is no where used for any other Officer or Minister in the Church, save onely the Prophets (such as Haggai, c. 1. 13. and John Baptist, Mat. 11. 10.) and the chiefe Priest, Mal. 2. 7.

3. Secondly, that, as to the words *Messenger*, and *Embassador*, there is in ordinary speech some considerable difference betweene them, the latter having in it a connotation of dignity, sustaining the person of the King, from whom he is sent immediately, which is not applicable to the former; And agreeably when it is used of St. Paul and Timothy, in whose name that Epistle is written [*πρεσβυτεροι* wee are Embassadors, 2 Cor. 5. 20.] there is added *Χριστου*, for, or, in the name, and authority of Christ, and againe wee pray you *πρεσβυτεροι*, which we well render, in Christs stead, as his proxies, for to Embassadors are; which being there applied to S. Paul an Apostle, and to Timothy, one employed by him immediately to preach and plant the faith, and after to governe in the Church, may by proportion belong to the Bishops their successors peculiarly.

4. Thirdly, that as the word *Ἀγγελος* signifies a Messenger, or Nuntio, so the word *Ἀπόστολος*, Apostle (according to the origination of it from *ἀποστέλλειν* to be sent) signifies also without any considerable difference, but yet is never thought fit, either in Scripture, or in the style of the Church to be applied to ordinary Ministers, but onely to those sent immediately by Christ, as he by his Father to plant and rule Churches, and to those who first succeeded them, or were employed by them in that great office.

5. But that which wholly frustrates the designe of the consideration, is this, that the singularity of the person, (one Angel in each of the seven Churches) is all that wee argue from, in this matter; For as to the power and authority in each Church, That is certainly pretended to (and not declined) by the Presbyterian as well as the Prelatist, the onely Question is, whether it be placed in one over the rest, or in

more than one, ruling together in common, and from the style of Christs Epistle to the Angel of the Church of Ephesus, and the like in each of the seven, wee thinke we conclude regularly, that it was one, it being certaine that the singular number is not the duall or plurall, and that [Angel] is a person, not an aggregate body or multitude.

7. And to the same purpose againe wee conclude: not from the mention of the Starres, not from their light or shining, but from their number, but seven in all, no more than there are Churches, i.e. one onely in each Church; And we know there is difference betweene a Star and an Asterisme or constellation, one single light, and a conjunction of many; And accordingly Mr. Brightman, that is resolved not to finde this truth in that Text, is forced to deale plainly, and to tell us, that the Epistles are not each of them sent to any one Angel, but to the Colledge of Pastors, *nec uni alicui Angelo mittuntur, sed toti, ut ita dicam, collegio Pastorum*, in Apoc. c. 2. 1. which being sufficiently contrary to the evidence of the Text, which reads ἀγγέλῳ to the Angel, in the singular, he thinkes fit to adde his reason for it; *Non enim unus erat Angelus Ephesied plures, nec inter istos aliquis Princeps*, for there was not one Angel of Ephesus, but many: nor any one among those principall or chiefe, which is the begging of the Question, or proving his assertion onely by asserting it; whereas Beza finding himselfe more prest by the force of the place, is forced to render it πρὸς ἀγγέλῳ, i.e. πρὸς ὧν, to the Angel, i.e. to the president, quem nimirum oportuit in primis de his rebus admoneri, who was in the first place to be admonished of these things.

8. What the πρὸς ὧν in the use of the Antient Church properly signifies, is showne at large out of Justin Martyr, Dionysius Bishop of Corinth, Marcellus Ancyranus and the Councell of Ephesus, Dissert. 4. c. 17. directly the same that we meane now by Bishop; But that I pretend not to thinke Beza meant by it (his Prolepses and espoused Principles leading him another way) All that I observe from the citation, is, that by the singularity of [ἀγγέλῳ the Angel] not Angels, he was forced to confesse a single person to be understood,

which is contrary to Mr. *Brightman*, and those that comprehend a *Colledge* of *Presbyters* under the title, which being yielded, I doubt not but our other evidences already produced (which must not be at every turn repeated) from the *Catalogue* of *Bishops* in the *Church* of *Ephesus*, &c. and the judgement of the *Universal Church* concerning those single persons, will conclude them indeed *αγγέλους*, not in *Beda's* notion, but in *Justin Martyr's* (who was much a more competent judge) i. e. the very *Bishops* which we pretend them to be; And truly I cannot discern any weak part (which may hazard being counted *ridiculous*) in this way of arguing.

Section VII.

Of their exception to our arguing from Symbols: Of Bishop and Elder being the same.

Num. 1.

THe last Consideration now remains in these words, *These titles of Stars and Angels are mysterious and metaphorical, It is said Rev. 1.20. The Mysterie of the seven Stars — And certainly it cannot be safe or solid to build the structure of Episcopacie by Divine Right upon mysterious and metaphorical denominations, Theologia Symbolica non est argumentativa, Especially if we consider that there are abundance of cleere texts that make Bishops and Presbyters to be one and the same; and it cannot be praise-worthy for any men (though never so learned in the esteem of the world) to oppose certain allegorical and mysterious titles to so many expresse testimonies of Scripture.*

2. To this the Answer will be satisfactory, though it should be but briefe, that we doe not found our argument in an allegorie. For 1. though the word *Stars* applyed to the *Governors* of *Churches* be onely figuratively so applyed, yet the word *ἄγγελος* (if the *Authors* of this consideration may be believed in that which immediately preceded) signifies (not an *Angel* from *Heaven*, or incorporeal substance, but) a *Messenger* or *Embassadour*, such as, say they, all *Ministers* are, And agreeably in that which is here annexed to prove the allegorical

gorical or mystical phrases (from Rev. 1. 20. the *Mystery of the seven Starres*) it is evident, that onely the word [*Starres*] is *Symbolical* or *Mystical*, and as evident that the *Angels* are not, for it is in the explicating and not in the forming of the *figure*, that the *Angels* of the *Churches* are mentioned, as the things which are signified by the *mystery* of the *Starres*, as the *Churches* themselves by the *Lamps*; and therefore as it would be absurd to say that a *symbol* is explicated by a *symbol*, one *mystery* by another, or proportionably that the *Churches*, by which the *Lamps* are exprest, are a *mystical allegorical phrase*, so it will be as unreasonable to affirme of the *Angels*, that they are a *mystery* or *allegorie*, because of the *Starres* it is affirmed that they are such, when indeed the word *Angel* is the interpretation and unfolding of the *mysterie*, which is as far from being the *mystery*, as the *light* is from being *darknesse*, which it expells out of the *horizon*, and is purposely sent by God to doe so.

3. But then *secondly*, 'tis yet more manifest, that if the word *Angel* were here used *figuratively* (as it is evident it was not, and was so confest, when it appeared *usefull* to the *Objectors* that it should not) yet it being the *singularity* of the person, wherein our *argument* is founded, our *argument* is not founded on that which is *mystical*. For certainly this *number* is a plaine *Grammatical* notation of a *singular* person, and that is prooffe enough that it was not a *collective* body, a *Presbytery* or *Consistory*, that is meant by it. And in this all the controversie betwixt us and the adversary consists, whether it was in *many* or in *one* in each *Church*, that the *Ecclesiastical* jurisdiction was vested, and that is sufficiently decided by that which is cleare and *unfigurative* in this *Text*, and cannot be imagined otherwise, but by forcing some *figure* on it, by which one *Angel* may be set for more *Ministers*, which if it be done, would not by their rule be *argumentative*.

4. *Thirdly*, Whereas it is suggested, that this which we conclude from hence, is *opposite* to many expresse testimonies of *Scripture*, I have no more to say in this place, where this is onely

only affirmed, but not attempted to be proved, but to profess my persuasion and assurance (the truth of which must be in the proceſſe of this diſcourſe conteſted) that there is no ſuch thing, but on the contrary, that the whole *Scripture*, and practice, and writings of the firſt ages of the Church, and the ſucceeding through all the world, agree directly with what I conclude from the ſingularity of the *Angel*; And when in the following words the *testimonies* are expreſſed to be thoſe which make *Bishops* and *Presbyters* to be one and the ſame, This alſo will immediately vaniſh, when it is remembered, what is largely deduced in the *Difſertations*, that the word *Bishop* in the *Scripture* is never uſed for a *Presbyter* in our *Moderne* notion of the word, but conſtantly for the one ſingle Governor in a Church or City, and that if there be any truth in that which is here affirmed, *Presbyters* muſt be taken in a notion diſtant from that in which now we uſe it, and ſignifie, as Πρεσβύτερος hath already been ſaid to doe, the ſingular *Bishop* in each Church, and 'tis certaine ſuch an identity of the names, will never be deemed contrary to what we have concluded from the *Angel*, but directly confirme it for us.

5. And although here is no occaſion in this place to prove and make good this aſſertion in each part of it, (the firſt poſitive, that Ἐπίσκοπος or *Bishop* in *Scripture* alwayes ſignifies the ſingular *Bishop*; the ſecond ſuppoſitive, that if Ἐπίσκοπος, *Bishop*, and Πρεσβύτερος Elder, be one and the ſame in *Scripture*, it muſt be by interpreting Πρεσβύτερος Elder, ſo as to ſignifie a *Bishop* in all place.) yet 'tis certaine, that this is already done at large in *Difſert. cap. 6. Sect. 19, 20, 21, 22.* and ſhall here againe be repeated and vindicated, when the proper place requires it, which I foreſee it will ſpeedily doe.

6. In the meane, I muſt take leave to expreſſe my preſent ſenſe, and hope that others will not thinke it too haſty, that no one of theſe five *Conſiderations*, nor conſequently all of them together, have at all prejudged our *Concluſion*. (now in hand) inferred from that of the *Epistle of Chriſt to the 7. Angels of the 7. Churches.*

Section VIII.

Of the singularity of each Angel. The objections from the use of the plurall number.

THESE considerations being thus laid as their foundation (and I suppose being already removed from superseding or hindring our *superstructure*) The next part of their method is, having mentioned our objection from the singularity of each Angel's person, to whom Christ's message or Epistle is sent, and the conclusion of an high Prelatist from hence, that these Angels are not onely Bishops but Archbishops, to apply *solid and every way sufficient answers to this Objection.* Num. 1.

2. In this proposall of our Objection, I shall not need to inquire who this high Prelatist is; The former intimations and directions have perswaded me that I am lookt on as this Objecter, though it be sufficiently knowne that the most Reverend Archbishop of Armagh, Lord Primate of Ireland, hath many yeares since deduced this conclusion in every part from this Text, and might, if they had pleased, have secured me from the opinion either of novelty, or singularity in the Assertion.

3. But I shall most willingly assume the burthen, and proceed to the view of the *solid and every way sufficient answers*, which are said to be given to this Objection, which though they be, it seemes to be fetcht out of *Smeftymunni*, &c. yet it happens well, that we shall (without need of consulting those larger volumes) find them here with more ease, reduced to two heads, One, that the word Angel signifies not a singular person, the second, that if it did, it will not at all advantage the Episcopal cause.

4. These two, I confesse, if either of them be solidly proved, will utterly drive us from our hold: The onely question at present is, whether in either part the proofes be solid, and of this we must now inquire, and first of the former of them.

5. This they thus propose, That the word Angel is not to be taken *ἰδιωτικῶς* but *συναντικῶς*, not individually, but colle-

Sively, for all the Pastors and Ministers of the respective Churches.

4. But before their proofes for such an assertion (that the *Angel* of such a *Church*, which is certainly an *individual*, as much as the *Bishop* of such a *Diocese*, is not yet to be taken *individually*) they first adde their *confession* that this answer is called a *poore shift*, a *vaine conceipt*, &c. but promise such reasons for the justification of it, which cannot be answered.

7. To the view of these *unanswerable Reasons* therefore we shall now hasten; And the first reason is, because our *Saviour* speaks to the *Angel* often in the plural number, *Rev. 2. 24. But unto you I say*, and the rest of *Thyatira*, and so *Rev. 2. 10. and 13. By which*, say they, *it is evident*, that by the word *Angel* is not meant one singular person, but the collective body of *Rulers*.

8. To this first reason I shall answer, by separating that one text of *Thyatira* from the other two, and all that are of the same nature with them, and speake first of these two, and remind them 1. that in an *Epistle* unquestionably address'd to a particular person, others under his care and charge may be, and are occasionally mentioned, so in that to *Titus*, *Paul's owne Sonne*, i. e. under the particular character of the beloved person converted by him; in the conclusion we finde these words, *Grace be with you all*, i. e. not with him as he must signifie a whole *Presbyterie*, but all the *sincere lovers of Christ*, and *Saint Paul*, they that love us in the faith, in the former part of the *verse*.

9. Secondly, that though the one *Angel* of the *Church* be the person to whom each part of the *Epistle* is address'd, yet in it are set downe the *sins* and *state* of the whole *Church*, i. e. of all the *believers* in it; Thus when the people of *Israel* or *Judah* were fallen into foule sins and provocations against *God*, it was ordinary for *God* to send a *Prophet* to the *King* of either of them, and admonish him what *reformations* were to be wrought, and what *judgements* were a coming in case of neglect. In which kind of messages of the *Prophet* delivered to the *King*, 'tis certaine that the whole people were

concerned, and so without question was it here, *Rev. 2. 10.* the *Devill shall cast some of you*, i. e. some *Members* of that *Church*, into prison, &c. and so *ver. 13. among you*, i. e. among you of that *Church* or *City*.

10. And indeed if each of those *Churches* had been governed by a *Consistory* of co-equal *Presbyters*, and those (as is pretended by our *adversaries*) signified by the *Angel*, yet there would be as little reason to doubt, but the sins of the people, as well as the *Clergy* were here reprehended by *Christ*, and the judgement threatened to one as well as to the other, And to this can be no reason to inferre the *Angel* to be no singular person, the *Church* ruled by one, making up a *multitude*, as well as if it were ruled by a *Presbytery*.

11. As for the place, *cap. 2. 24.* concerning *Thyatira*, that hath a different appearance, For the *Greek copie* ordinarily reading it [*ὑμῖν δὲ λέγω ἡ λοιπὸς τοῖς ἐν Θυατείρῃς*, But I say unto you (in the plural and to the rest which are in *Thyatira*)] the [you] in the plural, is by the *Objectors* thought necessarily to belong to the *Angel* of that *City*, as [the rest] to the community of the people. To this place therefore we have formerly answered, that the reading in the *Antient Manuscripts*, particularly in that belonging to the *Kings Library* at *Saint James's*, leaves out the [*καὶ, and*] and reads thus, *ὑμῖν δὲ λέγω τοῖς λοιποῖς*, But to you I say the rest which are in *Thyatira*] And this takes away all force from the objection, for the former part of the *Epistle* belonging to the *Angel*, who permitted *Jezebel*, and to them that committed fornication with her, the [*But*] in the front separates the [*ὑμῖν λοιποῖς, you the rest*] from the *Angel*, and those other formerly spoken to, and therefore the *ὑμῖν, you*, cannot possibly be the *Angel*, wherein all the strength of the *Objection* consists.

12. But this Answer, though taken notice of, is disliked: For, say they, he that shall view the *Antecedent* and *Consequent*, and consider that *ver. 23.* it is said, I will give to every one of you, &c. and then follows, but I say unto you, and then in the conclusion of the verse, I will put upon you no other burthen, will confesse that the old copies are better than that which is said to be *Teala's Manuscript*.

13. And here I shall desire the Reader to beare me company in obeying their directions, and observe what the Antecedents and Consequents can afford to the prejudice of that Antient copy. 'Tis most true, that v. 23. we read, *I will give to every one of you*, and that then it followes v. 24. *But I say unto you*, and in the conclusion of the verse. *I will put upon you* — But I demand, what will they conclude from hence? That by the word [you] in all these places the same persons are to be understood, and that those persons are the interpretation of the Angel v. 18? These two things they must conclude, or else they will faile in their designe, which is to shew that by the word Angel the collective body of Rulers is meant. But the first of these is evidently false, whatsoever reading be retained, for besides that the [I, But] doth clearly separate the second [you] from the first, and makes them distinct persons, The very matter of the speeches will convince it: For in the 23. v. the [you] are those that were corrupted by Iezabel v. 20. 22. who are now to be exemplarily punished and destroyed; *I will kill her* (i. e. Iezabels) *children with death* (as also: those that had committed Fornication with her v. 22.) and all the Churches shall know that *I am the searcher of hearts*, and *I will give to every of you according to your workes*; But the second [you] and so also the third, are the quite contrary to these, *As many as have not this Doctrine*, and *who have not knowne these depths of Satan*, and consequently, who are not to be punished, nor so much as admonished, but onely confirmed in their present practice, to hold fast what they have already.

14. So contrary is it to all appearance of truth, that the Antecedent and Consequent should favour their pretension.

15. This matter is so evident (the contrary conditions and fates of the [you] in v. 23. and the [you] in v. 24.) that if the ordinary reading were to be retained [ἐμὶν δὲ ὑπολοίτοις] and that rendred [to you and the rest in Thyatira.] so as to difference [you] and [the rest] another Antecedent to the Relative: [you] must necessarily be sought out, and then that can be no other but the Churches incidentally mentioned

v.23. who had not been charged for this crime. For as for the Angel v.18. if hee were not so remote (6. verses off) and if the singular number could be the Antecedent to the plural [*ὑμῖν, you*] (as it cannot) yet still he is charged for suffering the Woman *Jezebel*, and so is numbred among the guilty persons, that are to repent or be punished, and not to have no other burthen laid on them, save only to hold fast what they have, as is said of the second [*ὑμῖν you*] v. 24.

16. But the truth is, that of making the Churches the Relative is so inconvenient (and yet no other way imaginable to reconcile the ordinary reading) and the whole sense is so much more cleare and current in the reading of the King's M. S. [*But to you the rest in Thyatira* (those that had not beene guilty of the misbehaviours censured, and threatned in the former Verses) that I professe I cannot discern any appearance of reason to question the truth of it; much lesse to conceive that the ordinary copies are better; which yet however they read it, must oppose the [*ὑμῖν you*] to those before mentioned, and so cannot apply it with any appearance of probability to the Angel, or consequently pre-judge ours, or confirme their pretensions.

Section I X.

Of the Elders at Ephesus *Act. 20.*

A Second reason to prove the Angel to be a collective body, is this, because it is certaine that the Church of Ephesus was a collective body, and that there were many Presbyters to whom St. Paul, at his finall departure from them, committed the charge of that Church: And these Presbyters are called Bishops, and were all of them Stars of the same magnitude, and Angels of the same order without a difference or distinction.

Numb. 11.

2. But this is a way of proving a thing which is denied, by another which they know is equally denied by him, against whom they dispute, and therefore that argument can be of no force with us.

3. 'Tis most true indeed, what they begin with, that the Church of Ephesus was a collective body, for so 'tis certaine every Church is, whether governed by one or more Rulers; But the Church is not the Angel, any more than the candle-sticks are the Stars, but punctually distinguished from them Rev. 1.20. But this I suppose was a mistake hastily fallen from them, and I shall not pursue it any farther.

4. Their argument, I conceive, depends upon the plurality of Elders [*πρεσβύτεροι*] which were at Ephesus Act. 20. when Paul takes his leave of them, and calls them Bishops. But to this they know I have answered clearly, that as in other places of Scripture, so in that, the word *πρεσβύτεροι* Elders, being all one with *ἐπίσκοποι*, Bishops, denote (not the many Presbyters of the one City of Ephesus, but) the many Bishops of that and other Cities of Asia, which at that time by S. Paul's summons sent to Ephesus, the chiefe Metropolis of Asia, were called and met together at Miletus.

* L. 3. 6. 14.

5. To this purpose * Irenaeus is a witness beyond exception, who speaking of these Elders or Bishops, adds, *ab Epheso & proximis civitatibus convocatos esse, that they were assembled from Ephesus and the next Cities*, in which as the faith was planted, as well as in Ephesus (even in all Asia) so there is no reason to doubt but there were Bishops in them, as well as in Ephesus (seven such Churches we know are here mentioned in the Revelation) and that Paul was as carefull to take his leave of them (as many as could conveniently come to Miletus in his hasty progresse) as of the Bishop of Ephesus hee is justly deemed to have been.

6. Other arguments and authorities I need not here accumulate for this notion of Elders Act. 20. because here is no appearance of reason offered to prove their, or impugne our Assertion. This perhaps will be afterward attempted, and then I shall, as occasion requires, farther enlarge: In the meane it sufficeth that it yet no way appears, that Ephesus was governed by many Presbyters, and not by one Bishop, and therefore this second offer of reason is as deficient as the first, to prove the Angel of that Church to have been a collective body.

Section

Section X.

Of expressing a number by singulars. A Church by a Candlestick. Of the seven Angels Rev. 8.

THEIR third reason is, because It is usuall with the Holy Ghost, not onely in other Bookes of Scripture, but in this very Booke of the Revelation, in mysterious and prophetick writings, and visionall representations (such as this of the Starres and Golden Candlestick is) to expresse a number of things or persons in singulars. And this in visions is the usuall way of Representation of things, a thousand persons making up one Church is represented by one Candlestick, many Ministers making up one Presbytery by one Angel. Thus Rev. 8. 2. It is said that John saw seven Angels which stood before God. By these seven Candlesticks (I suppose it should be seven Angels) Dr. Reynolds doth not understand seven individuall Angels, but all the Angels; For there are no seven individuall Angels that stand before God, but all doe, Dan. 7. there are many more instances brought in the Bookes forementioned. Num. 1.

2. To this third Reason I have no obligation or notice to give credit, any farther than the evidences perswade, for many of which, though we are referred to *Smectymnus*, &c. yet having received promise from these, that they would borrow a few things from those others; I shall with reason hope that what they have upon choice borrowed, leaving, as they say, much more behind, is the most satisfactory and solid of any thing by them produced; and consequently if there be no force in these instances to oppugne our conclusion, we shall not expect to finde more convincing ones by travailing farther, and gathering up out of those *dispersions*, what they have refused to take up and offer to us.

3. The thing they would prove is, that 'tis usuall with the Holy Ghost in this (as in other mysterious prophetick Bookes) to expresse a number of things or persons by singulars. Their proofes are but three, and the first is of no force, because the word *Church* denotes a singular thing, as well as *Candlestick* that represents it; for though a thousand men make up one Church,

Church, yet one Church is but one thing, considered as a Church, and proportionably as one Candlestick in the singular is set to denote each Church, so there are seven Candlesticks to represent the seven Churches.

4. As for the second, that of the Angels, that that signifies many Ministers, that cannot be offered as a prooffe, being it selfe the matter of the question. And indeed though Church be a collective body, and so one Church is knowne to consist of many men, yet Angel is not of that nature, one Angel neither signifies many men, nor many Angels.

5. And whereas the parallel is set betwixt the word Candlestick, and the word Angel, that they (each) are singular words, by which multiitudes are represented, that is a mistake, for the parallel lyes betwixt Church and Angel (and on the other side betwixt Candlestick and Starre, as appeares Rev. 1.20.) and both these are individual things, the Church an individual Church, and there be seven such individual Churches, and the Angel an individual Angel, and there be seven such individual Angels, and there can be no more pretense that one Angel should signifie many Ministers, than that one Church should signifie many Congregations.

6. Lastly, for the third prooffe, that of seven Angels, Rev. 8. 2. if that were granted to Doctor Reynold's authority, that the [seven Angels] there signifies all the Angels, yet would it not at all contribute to the prooffe of the point in hand, which is, that many shall be signified by a singular, for we know that seven are not a singular, but the custome indeed being ordinary to use a certaine definite number, for an uncertaine or indefinite, and the septenary being a perfect number, and so fittest for the turne, 'tis more tolerable that the number of seven may represent some greater number, one plural a larger plural, than that a singular one should doe so.

7. And yet secondly, there is no great reason to doubt, but that the seven Angels are indeed very seven Angels, and no more; This I collect, 1. from the seven Trumpets that were given them, ver. 2. and the specifying them by that Character, the seven Angels, which had the seven Trumpets, ver. 6. Secondly, by the severall employments assigned them in the sub-

subsequent parts of the vision which brings them upon the scene one after another, the first Angel, ver. 7. the second Angel, ver. 8. and so to the seventh. Thirdly, by the distinction that is evidently made between those seven Angels and another Angel, ver. 3. And another came and stood at the Altar: which makes it certaine that the former seven did not signifie all the Angels, unlesse after all, there could yet be one more. Fourthly, from the mention of the seven Spirits, cap. 1. 4. which are said to be before Gods throne, that sure is all one with standing before him here, and it being certaine that Angels are Spirits, I have no reason to doubt but that these seven Angels are those seven spirits, and so still a definite number of seven, and no more. Fifthly, from the mention of the seven Eyes, Zach. 4. 10. which seeme to be interpreted to this sence, Rev. 5. 6. seven eyes which are the seven Spirits of God sent into all the Land.

8. And though in some of these places other men have had other notions, yet *δοκιμάσαντες τὸς ἀγγέλους ταῦτα νοεῖν*, 'tis more to be approved that we understood Angels by that phrase, cap. 1. saith *Andreas Casariensis*, And of the whole matter, *Ἐπὶ τῶν εἰσὶν ἐν τῷ μεγίστῳ δυναμὶς ἑξ ὧν, πρῶτόγονοι Ἄγγέλων ἀρχόντες*, there are seven which have the greatest power, the first borne Princes of the Angels, saith *Clemens Alexandrinus*. In which words of his, the first borne Princes are evidently taken from *Dan. 10. 13.* where the Hebrew reads *הַרְאֲשֵׁנִים שְׂרִיפִים* the Principal or first rulers or Princes, of which *Michael* is the first, and thence called *Archan-gel*.

Strom. 6.

9. And so in *Tobit*, cap. 12. 15. we find seven holy Angels which present the prayers of the Saints, which description of them and their office, to present the prayers of the Saints, if it be thought unagreeable to their standing here before God or being before his throne, it will soone be reconciled by that speech of Christ, that the Angels of the infant tender Christians alwayes behold the face of God, and by that meanes are qualified to make their wants knowne unto him, which is all one with presenting of prayers.

10. Sixthly, from the mention of the seven Lamps, Rev. 4. 5.

H

(styled

(styled *Lamps*, in reference to the like number of *Lamps* on the *Candlestick* in the *Sanctuary*) which *burne before the throne*, as cap. i. they are *before the throne*, For of these it is added *αι ητοι τα εντα πνευματα τω θυ*, which are the *seven* (by way of eminencie, or the *seven Principal*) *spirits of God*.

11. *Seventhly*, from the no appearance of the least reason produced to the contrary; For as to that which is introduced with a [*For*] and supplies the place of a *reason*; it is evidently a bare assertion of the contrary, [*there are no seven individual Angels that stand before God*] without any offer of prooffe, that testimony out of *Dan. 7.* that all doe, being far from concluding that there are not such *seven principal Angels* which these so many evidences assure us there are.

12. In that of *Dan. 7. 10.* upon that solemne occasion of *God's judgements* exprest by a *fiery streame*, *thousand thousands* are said to *Minister to him*, and *ten thousand times ten thousand* to *stand before him*. But how doth that hinder but at another time, *seven principal Angels* may be employed by him, and in order to that *stand before him* too, and when we so oft reade of such *seven*, what question but they were *individual Angels*? And so much for the *third reason*.

Section XI.

Of the Epistles being sent to the Whole Church, not to the Bishop only. Of Timothy, Onesimus and Polycarp, being Bishops of some of the Asian Churches, without any charge of Apostacy falling on them by this means.

Numb. 1.

THere is a fourth behind; still, that though but one Angel be mentioned in the fore-front, yet it is evident that the Epistles themselves (though we are farre from thinking that in formal denomination, the Angels and the Candlesticks are the same) are dedicated to all the Angels and Ministers in the Church, and to the Churches themselves, as appears, *Rev. 1. 10. Rev. 2. 7. 11. 17.* And therefore when it is said in the singular number, *I know thy works, This thou hast, Repent and doe thy first works, &c. All these.*

these and the like places are not to be understood as meant of one individual person, but of the whole company of Ministers, and also of the whole Church, because the punishment threatened is to the whole Church, Rev. 2. 5. 16. 2. Now we have no warrant in the word to thinke that Christ would remove his Gospel from a Church for the sin of one Bishop, when all the other ministers and Churches are farre from those sins.

2. To this I shall need make no reply, having done it sufficiently already, by concession that the *Angel* being the Ruler of a Church, the whole *Epistle* belongs to him and the Church promiscuously, and agreeably those expressions, which are used in the singular number, doe not all belong to the Bishop, but to the Church wherein he *presides*: But certainly this is farre from inferring that the Bishop and Church are all one, or that the word *Angel* signifies the collective body of the Church, for, besides that the Text is expresse in making a signall difference between the *Starres* and the *Candlesticks*, the *Angels* and the *Churches* (and the *Assemblers* are here forced to confesse that the *Angels* and *Candlesticks* are not the same) the confounding them will be as disadvantageous to them as to us, and I shall as regularly be able to conclude that the word *Angel* signifies not the *Presbytery*, but the whole diffusive body of the Church, as they can pretend to doe upon their owne *postulatum*, that the *Angel* denotes not the Bishop but the whole Church, it being as certaine that they make a difference between the Church or multitude of believers, and the *Presbytery* that is set over them to rule, as we doe between the same Church and the Bishop.

3. Thus have we viewed all the reasons produced by them to assert or confirme their first answer, and shewed divers wayes how no manner of validity there is in any one or all of them, to evidence it to be a solid and every way sufficient answer. And therefore there was some use of the next part of the Method, to call in the authority of other men to countenance this interpretation, Master Brightman, Master Perkins, Master Foxe, (who citeth *Primasius Haymo Beda, Richardus, Thomas, &c.*) Doctor Fulke, Master Meade, Gregory and Saint Austin; But although they have thought fit to

set downe these names, yet having omitted to adde their *Testimonies*, and indeed having resolved to forbear, because *Smeetyminus* hath done it already, I shall confesse my selfe willing to leave this *chase*, and in stead of leading the Reader so wearisome a walke, to examine the severall *comments* here named (and but named) give him more shortly my *conjecture* what truth may be in them.

4. Master *Brightman*, I know (and some others 'tis possible) may have interpreted the *Angel* to signifie the whole *College of Pastors*, and truly I should much sooner take up an *Interpretation* upon the bare word of these *Assemblers*, than I would upon no better evidence from *M. Brightman*; He was one learned man, long knowne to be unkinde to our *Pralates*, and here are many, for ought I know, as learned, though under the same *prajudices*.

5. Some others here cited, I cannot believe are brought to testifie this, but onely that what is said to the *Angel* in each part of the *Epistle*, was said to the whole *Church*, and not onely to the *Bishop*; and if that be all they say, it is that which we cannot doubt to affirme with them, and have oft confest to understand *Christ's Epistle* so, without any incommmodity to our pratenions.

6. If I mistake in these *conjectures*, I desire pardon, and shall hope to give a better account, when I read the *testimonies* in the *Authors* from whence they are cited. For in these *derivations* of *testimonies*, the *Assemblers* citing them from *Smeetyminus*, *Smeetyminus* from Master *Foxe*, Master *Foxe* from *Primasius*, &c. there is great possibility of mistake, and therefore I shall follow the example before me, forbear adding any more of this matter.

7. In the next place they are pleased to take notice as of an *objection* against their *interpretation*, that some *Authors* say, *Timothy was Bishop of Ephesus when our Saviour wrote this Epistle*, others that *Onesimus was Bishop*, others that *Polycarp was Bishop of Smyrna at that time*, and therefore these *Angels* must needs be taken individually for so many single persons.

8. Of this *Objection*, which they have thus formed for us, there:

there is onely thus much of truth, that out of *authentique Records* we bring undeniable evidences for *Timothies* being constituted by *St. Paul* Bishop of *Ephesus*, for *Onesimus* being placed in that *See* at the time of *Ignatius's* writing to the *Ephesians*, that *Polycarpe* was constituted Bishop of *Smyna* by *S. John*, of all which we have spoken enough already.

9. But of all or any of these being Bishops in those Cities at the very time of *Christ's* addressing this *Epistle* to the Angels of each, this had no where been our affirmation, nor would it have been usefull to us in any considerable degree, if we had grounds positively to affirme it. All that is needfull to us is this, that by the *Antient Records*, which evidence them to have been so early Bishops in two of those Churches, to which *Christ's Epistle* was sent, and Bishops in the notion wherein we now use the word, we are secured of the truth of our collections, when from the mention of the seven Angels of the 7. Churches, we assert the Ecclesiasticall power in the hands of a single Bishop in each Church to be owned and confirmed by *Christ*; And supposing some other persons, and none of these three to have been those very *numericall Angels* to whom those *Epistles* were written, this conclusion of ours stands yet as firme, as if we could demonstrate it of those very *numericall* persons, there being no reason to doubt but the same manner of Government continued all the *Scripture* times; and to *Timothies* successor and *Onesimus's* predecessor, being as certainly Bishops, as either *Onesimus* or *Timothy* himselfe; when withall we have already produced mentions from the *Antients* of the Catalogues of those Bishops which succeeded *Timothy* in that *See*.

10. Having thus set right the *Objection* for them, so as it is owned by us to be an *Objection* against them, it will now soone appeare what force there is in their answers to it, and those are three.

11. First, that they that say that *Timothy* was then Bishop, offer no little injury to him, for they thereby charge him to be guilty of *Apostacy*, and of losing his first love, and so out of a blind zeale to *Episcopacy* they make that glorious Saint to stand charged as an *Apostate*. The like injury is offered by *Objections* to *Onesimus*.

12. But first you see whatever our *opinion* is exprest to be we have not *affirmed* either of these, as to the *person* either of *Timothy* or *Onesimus*, but lest it uncertaine who the *Angel* of the *Church* of *Ephesus* was, whether either or neither of these, but some *successor* of the one, and *predecessor* of the other, and so what charge soever falls on that *Angel*, it falls not necessarily on either of these.

13. Secondly it is already agreed betwixt the parties, affirmed by them, and acknowledged by me, that the *Epistle* being adrest to the *Angel* of *Ephesus*, the *Church* or *diffusive* body, the *Christians* in it, were concerned in the *contents* of it; And then whatsoever charge be found in the *Epistle*, of how heavy a nature soever, even of *Apostacy* it selfe, yet there is no necessity the *Angel* or *Bishop* should be *personally* guilty of it, and so whosoever the *Bishop* was, though *Timothy* himselfe, our *zeale* to *Episcopacy* hath not beene so *blind* or *transporting*, as to put us on any *uncharitable* censure, to affix any *unhandsome* character upon so *glorious* a *Saint*.

14. Lastly, to remove this answer yet one degree farther from being satisfactory, it no where appeares that *Apostacy* is in that *Epistle* laid to the charge, whether of the *Church* or *Angel*; The first part is all in *commendation* of their *former* zeal, and the later, wherein their charge consists, v. 4. is only this [*ἀγάπῃ οὗ τὴν πρῶτην ἀφῆκας*] which is not (as is suggested) *losing* their *first* love, but *remitting* it; Their love to *Christ* had formerly been *strong* as death, pure and vehement, such as had *cast out* all *fear* of dangers, and evidenced it selfe in *couragious* confession, but now, though it were not quite lost, yet it was remitted, lessened in the degree, not so *intense* as formerly, and therefore when they are bid *remember* from whence they are fallen, that *fall* doth not necessarily signifie *Apostacy* or *renouncing* of *Christianity* (for then it had been an *impertinent* threatening to remove their *Chandlestick* v. 5.) but a *falling* from the former degree, a *cooling* of the *intense* heat, which had been so laudable in them. And so still there is more invalidity in this first answer.

Section XII.

Of Timothy being an Evangelist, that it hinders not his being a Bishop.

THe second is, that they have already proved that Timothy Num. 1.
was an Evangelist in a proper sense, and therefore cannot
be called Bishop of Ephesus in their sense.

2. To this I reply, 1. That *Timothies* being an Evangelist
no way prejudgeth his being a Bishop in our sense, An Evan-
gelist is one commissioned by any of the Apostles' *Evange-*
λίζουσαι to preach the Gospel to any City or People; And a
Bishop is one commissioned by the like Apostle to preside in,
and governe a Church already planted. And what hinders
but that he that hath beene employed in the former capacity
to plant, may elsewhere or in the same place be appointed to
Governe, and so the Evangelist be a Bishop?

3. Whatsoever Objections can be brought against this, I
shall not doubt will be easily answered, but there is no offer of
any here, and therefore it will not be pertinent farther to treat
it in this place.

4. Secondly, it must againe be remembred, that what is
here said of Timothy is proper to his person, both from *Onc-*
simus and *Polycarpe*, and all other Angels, whether succeed-
ing Timothy in Ephesus, or presiding in the other 7. Asian
Churches, and therefore though Timothy by being an Evan-
gelist were rendered incapable (which yet he was not) of
being the Bishop of Ephesus in our sense, yet those other seven
Angels at the very time of the writing this Epistle of which
none have been proved to be Evangelists, may still be Bishops
in our sense.

5. Thirdly, I shall demand upon the Assemblers principles,
who allow a *Primus Presbyter*, a *Prolocutor* in their consistory
or Councell of Presbyters, might Timothy be that first Presby-
ter in the Church of Ephesus, or did his being an Evangelist
hinder him from being so, when he was by St. Paul exhorted
or appointed *μενεσθαι* to abide in that City? I cannot imagine
they will say he could not, who give both St. Peter and
St.

St. John leave to call themselves *Presbyters*; But if he could in their opinion, then why might he not be a *Bishop* in our sense (notwithstanding that he was an *Evangelist*) as well as a *Presbyter* in theirs? I foresee not what answer can be adapted to this *Dilemma*.

Section XIII.

Of the Bishops at Ephesus. Of the plurall number in the Epistle to the Angel of Smyrna.

Num. I.

There remains a third branch of the Answer, that it will not follow because Onesimus was Bishop of Ephesus in St. John's days, that therefore he was the onely person to whom Christ wrote his Epistle; For St. Paul tells us there were many Bishops at Ephesus (besides the supposed Onesimus) and Christ may very well write to him, and to all the rest as well as him. The like may be said concerning Polycarpe, for our Saviour speaks to the Angel of the Church of Smyrna in the plurall number, Rev. 2. 10. And therefore hee may truly be said to write to all the other Angels that were at Smyrna, as well as to one.

2. Here is nothing in this branch but what hath beene distinctly forestall'd, and spoken to largely already, it will suffice that we repeat the heads, and leave the Reader to view the places, where they are more explicitly handled. And 1. though St. Paul should tell us that there were many Bishops at Ephesus, as there might be from other Cities occasionally met there, yet it would not follow that there were more than one Bishop of that City, or consequently that Christ in a peculiar addresse to the Angel of that City could write to more Bishops there.

3. But then secondly, the whole truth is this, that S. Luke (and not St. Paul) tells, that upon St. Paul's summons sent to Ephesus, many Bishops met him at Miletus; Ephesus being the chiefe Metropolis was the fittest meanes to convey the summons to the Cities neer it, and from them and not onely from

from them, and not onely from *Ephesus* came the *Bishops* to him, as hath been declared out of *Irenaeus*.

4. Thirdly, for our *Saviour's* speaking to the *Angel* of the *Church* of *Smyrna* in the *plurall* number, that is not punctually true, for though the letter be written and inscribed to the *Angel*, yet, as hath oft been said, the *whole Church* is concerned in the contents of it, and so speaking to the *Angel* in the *singular*, he may yet speake to the *Church* or any members thereof, in the *plurall* number. And so much againe to demonstrate the ineffectualnesse of the first Head of Answers.

Section XIV.

Of Beza's Interpretation, of the President.

THe second followes upon a supposition (but not grant) that Numb. 1.
these Angels were persona singulares, and that the word Angel is to be taken individually, yet they conceive this will not at all advantage the Episcopall cause. For 1. Mr. Beza (no great friend to Episcopacy) acknowledgeth that by these words to the Angel is meant ὁ πρῶτος ὁτι to the President, as whom it behooved speciall. to be admonished touching those matters, and by him both the rest of his Collegues, and the whole Church likewise; but then he addeth, But that Episcopal degree which was afterward by humane invention brought into the Church of God, certainly neither can nor ought to be from hence concluded. Nay, not so much as the Office of a perpetuall President should be of necessity as the thence arising Oligarchical tyranny (whose head is the Antichristian beast) now at length with the most certaine ruine, not of the Church onely, but of the word also, maketh manifest; By which quotation it is evident, that though Beza held the Angel to be a singular person, yet he held him to be Angelus Praeses, not Angelus Princeps; and that he was Praeses pro tempore, just as a Moderator in an Assembly, or as a Speaker in Parliament.

2. To this I reply, 1. that Mr. Beza's interpretation, as it was foreknown and formerly mentioned by us, so was it
not

not in reason to be of any force or *authority* with us, if it be but upon the score intimated here, that he was not onely *no great friend*, but a knowne *profest enemy* of *Episcopacy*, and so was obliged to be, by the course wherein he was engaged at *Geneva*. All that his authority concludes, is, that to avoid a plaine testimony, which is not for his turne, a man may be induced to affirme that *confidently*, for which he hath no ground of prooffe, nay, wherein all wayes of *evidence*, that the matter is capable of, are *absolutely* against him.

3. Thus 'tis certainly in this matter, for when *Beza* hath here acknowledged that the *Angel* was the *πρεσβυς President*, who will be the most competent *Judge* or *Witness*, to determine what was meant by the *πρεσβυς President*] in the *Primitive Church*, what kind of *Presidency* he had, whether onely of *place* or *order*, and that onely for a *time*, or of *superiority* of *power* and *office*, and that *perpetuall* ? In all reason this is to be fetcht from those first Writers which speake of it, and either use the very word *πρεσβυς President*, for such a *Bishop*, as we now assert (a *singular* person in every *Church*, having a power for life over all the *Officers* and *Members* of the *Church*, and succeeding some *Apostle*, or *Apostolicall* person in that *power*) or else in other words affirme the same thing.

* *Disert.* 4.

4. Of this store of evidences are * elsewhere produced, in the explication of the severall titles, by which this *singular presfect* was antiently knowne, whether of *Apostle*, in a *secondary* use of that word, of *Angel*, of *Bishop*, of *Elder*, of *Ruler*, of *Pastor*, of *Doctor*, of *Steward*, of *President*, of *Priest* ; Against which the bare authority of Mr. *Beza's* name, who hath fancied a temporary *President* or *Prolocutor*, and brought no manner of reason to confirme it, will have very little validity in it.

5. What is proved by the bare testimony of *Beza*, is farther confirmed by a like citation out of the Reverend Divines at the Isle of Wight, who by the example of the King sending a message, to both Houses, and directing it To the Speaker of the House of Peeres, which inferres not that either the Speaker is *always* the same person, or the *Governour*, or *Ruler* of the two Houses.

Houses in the least, conclude, that notwithstanding this direction of Christ's Epistle to the Angels, yet they might be neither Bishops, nor yet perpetuall Moderators.

6. But the authority of those *Divines*, which had this answer from *Beza*, adds nothing of weight, because nothing of proofe to it; As for their *similitude*, it concludes nothing but this, that these *Divines* thought fit to make use of this instance of a *Speaker* in *Parliament*, to shew the thing possible to have been, not to prove that so it was, And the matter of our present inquiry, is not, what a kinde of *president Christ* and his *Apostles* might, if they would, have left in each *Church*, but what really they did; And that must be contested by the best *Records* of those times, not by a *similitude* of a *Speaker* in our *Parliaments*. And that is all I neede to say to that *Section*.

Section X V.

Of Dr. Reynolds interpretation, of the Bishop in Cyprian. Of Ordination by Bishops not without Presbyters, from the Testimonies of Cyprian, and Fermilian.

After the authority of Mr. *Beza*, backt with that of the *Divines* at the *Isle of Wight*, is added, in the second place, the authority of Dr. *Reynolds*, who as he hath a *Letter in print* against the *Divine Right of Episcopacy*, so he acknowledgeth also in his conference with *Hart*, Dial. 3. That this *Angel* was persona singularis: For he saith, Numb. 1.

2. The whole place of Dr. *Reynolds* is set down at large by the *Archbishop of Armagh* in the front of his learned *Dissertation* of the *Originall of Bishops and Metropolitans*, and I shall not neede here to recite it, being of some length, and indeed nothing in it defined or exprest of his opinion, that the *President*, when he was made such, either continued to be equall with the rest of the *Presbyters*, or lasted but for a time, so as the *Prolocutor* of an *Assembly* doth; I am sure he affirms him to have had the *Presidentship* (not among, but) over *Elders* (which I suppose must imply some power) and that

this was he that in the *Primitive Church* the *Fathers* called *Bishop*, and applies to him the mentions of *Bishops* made by *St. Cyprian* (and *Cornelius*) of whose notion of *Bishops*, that it belongs not to a bare *Prolocutor* of an *Assembly*, nay, that in nothing it differeth from ours, I am sufficiently assured, and so will the *Reader* by what is cited from him *Dissert. 3. c. 3. §. 13.* And because from some other intimations in this *Book* * *Append. p. 219* I see there is neede of it, I shall here πεισσειν out of many, mention this one *evidence* more.

Ego & Collega
mei qui prae-
ses aderant.

3. In the 60 *Epistle* to *Rogatian* a *Bishop*, who had beene wronged and *contumeliously* used by a *Deacon* of his *Church*, and had written an account of it to *Cyprian* and the * *annual* *Councell* of *Bishops* with him, *Cyprian* returns this Answer, that it was his *humility* to make this *complaint* to the *councell*, Cum pro *Episcopatus* vigore, & *Cathedrae* autoritate haberes potestatem, quâ possis de illo statim vindicari, when by force of his *Episcopall* power, and by authority of his *chaire*, hee had power himselfe to inflict punishment on him immediatly, and that punishment afterward specified, ut eum deponas vel abstineas, either to depose him or suspend him.

4. Here it was a part of *Rogatian's* *Episcopall* power, without any joyning with him, to judge and censure the inferior Officers of the *Church*, and they were bound *honorem sacerdotis agnoscere & Episcopo praeposito suo*—as it followes in that *Epistle*, to acknowledge the honour of their *Priest*, and with full *humility* make satisfaction to the *Bishop* which is set over them. All power in the hands of one set over all, call'd promiscuously *Priest* and *Bishop* in *Cyprian's* style.

5. And therefore when in the *Appendix* to this *Book*, these men to prove that *Ordination* by *Bishops* without the assistance of *Presbyters* was *always* forbidden and opposed, tell us of *Aurelianus*'s being ordained by *Cyprian*, and his *Collegues*, *Ep. 33.* and then assure us from *Ep. 58.* that by his *collegues* he meanes his *Presbyters* (where yet there is no other proove of it, but the using of these words in the *Inscription* of the *Epistle*, *Cyprianus cum Collegis*, and *Ego & collega*, *Cyprian* with his *collegues*, and *I and my collegues*) This is a great, but discernible fallacy put upon the *Reader*, as will soone appeare

1. If we but observe that the 33 *Epistle*, where he tells of *Aurelius*, was written by *Cyprian* to his *Presbyters*, and so they are the persons whom he adviseth, what he and his *Collegues* had done, and so sure were not those *Collegues* that did it with him. Or secondly, if for the understanding *Cyprian's* notion of *Collegues*, *Ep.* 58. we shall but looke forward to the next *Epistle* 59. for that will fully discover it, being this, *Cyprianus & ceteri Collega qui in Concilio assuerunt numero LXVI.* where *Cyprian's Collegues* are evidently the 66. *Bishops* that were in *Council* with him.

6. The like might be also observed of the *Testimony* out of *Firmilian*, which they there subjoyne, of the *Seniores* and *Præpositi* that have power of ordaining, by whom, say they, the *Presbyters* as well as the *Bishops* are understood; But againe 'tis cleare by the expresse words of the *Epistle*, that by them are meant the *Bishops* in their annual *Council*, *Necessariis apud nos fit ut per singulos annos Seniores & Præpositi in unum conveniamus* — 'Tis necessary that every yeare we the *Elders* and *Governors* should meet together to dispose and order those things which are committed to our care, adding concerning the *Church* (in opposition to *Hereticks*) that all power and grace is placed in it, *ubi præsident majores natu, qui & Baptizandi & manum imponendi & ordinandi possident potestatem*, wherein the *Elders* præside, and have power of *Baptizing*, *absolving* and *ordaining*, an evident description of the *Bishops*. But this by the way, as an essay, what their *testimonies* out of the *Fathers*, scattered sometimes in this Book, would be found to be, if this were a place to examine them.

7. Lastly *Dr. Reynolds* acknowledges another *Præsident* even among *Bishops*, the *Bishop* of the chiefest City in the *Province*, and so a *Metropolitan*. All which are contrary enough to the pretensions of the *Presbyterians* (what amends he hath made them in his *Printed letter* I know not.)

8. Yet after all this, there lyes no obligation upon us to regulate our *Doctrine* by *Doctor Reynolds's* scheme in this matter, being sufficiently instructed by the *Primitive* records and practice, what kind of power and dignity belonged to the *Presbiter* or *Præsident* among them, the very same that we now

pretend to be the *Bishops* due, And if *Christ's* letter were addressed to the *Angel*, as to such a *Negós* or *President*, 'tis all that we desire, to erect our fabrick of *Episcopacy* on this one place, if there were not (as there are) others able to support the weight of it.

9. And so we see what reasons have been brought to make good their second head of *Answers*, of which we had promise that they were *solid and every way sufficient answers*, and yet in the issue there is nothing so much as offered toward it, save onely the *testimony* of *Mattheus Beza*, the *Divines* at the *Iste of Wight* (which is by interpretation themselves) and *Doctor Reynolds*, who yet is not perfectly of their party neither.

Section XVI.

Of the Churches of Asia being Metropolitcal. Of the paucity of believers.

Num. I.

HAVING thus done, they say *It is objected by some men that the seven Cities, in which these seven Asian Churches had their seat, were all of them Metropolitcal, and so had relation to the rest of the Towns and Cities of Asia, as unto daughters rising under them, and that therefore these Churches were Metropolitcal Churches, and their Angels Metropolitcal Bishops.*

2. How this comes to be styled an *objection* I cannot well guess, or what it is, against which it is thought to be *objected*. The truth of it, as farre as any *Episcopal* person I know, is interess'd in it, is this, It is not onely evident of the *Angels* of the *seven Asian Churches*, that they were *Bishops*, which is sufficient for us against the *Assemblers*, but there is over and above that, all reason to deem them *Starres* of a *first magnitude*, i. e. *Bishops* of *Mother-Cities*, *Metropolitcans* and that very pertinent to be urged in this matter of the *Asian Angels*, not to secure the proofes of *Episcopacy* taken from thence, but to render a reason why in all *Asia* but *seven Churches* and their *Bishops* are named there. To this purpose the

the discourse is enlarged (above what it needed to have been) *Dissert. 4. 5.* to set downe the nature of *Metropolitans*, the exemplars of them among the *Jewes*, the expresses of the Institution in the *Apostles* writings, and the signal evidences of it in the *Primitive Church*, and the *Antient Canons* in the *Council of Nice* and *Antioch*, and *Ephesus*, all owning them as *Primitive* and *Apostolical Institutions*, and all this exemplified in *Jerusalem*, in *Antioch*, in *Rome*, in *Alexandria*, in *Gortyna* of *Crete*, and at length in all the *Seven Churches of Asia*.

3. What is there thus set down, if it have not perfect truth in it, I shall be very glad to see the weak parts of that discourse discovered, and therefore though I never proposed or meant it as an *Objection* of ours against the *Presbyterians*, having no need of such *auxiliaries*, and the whole matter being sufficiently proved without it, and this onely added *ex abundanti*, yet I shall most willingly attend their motions, and see what answers they will adapt to this *Objection*, as they call it.

4. And 1. they answer, that it will hardly be proved that these seven Cities were all of them *Metropolitan Cities* in *S. John's* dayes, And the situation of most them lying neerer together on the *Sea side* makes it very improbable.

5. To this I reply, that for five of them, *Ephesus*, *Smyrna*, *Sardis*, *Pergamus*, and *Laodicea*, *Pliny*, that lived and wrote in the beginning of *Vespasian's* reigne, is a competent witness, that they were Cities wherein the *Roman Proconsuls* fixt their Courts or Seats of Judicature, and administred justice there to all the Cities about them, and that is the interpretation of a chiefe City or *Metropolis*, in the secular account, and agreeably *Ulpian* mentions *Ephesus* as the chief of these *Metropoles*. And for the other two, *Philadelphia* and *Thyatira*, the latter of these by **Ptolomee*, the former by the *Council of Constantinople sub Menâ* is punctually affirmed to be a *Metropolis*. To these are added other evidences and reasons, and the *Lord Arch-Bishop of Armagh* hath written (besides his *Original of Metropolitans*) a very learned *Dissertation* of the *Lydian Asia*, on purpose to cleare this matter.

Lib. 5. c. 29. 30.

* Greg. l. 5. c. 2.

6. And

6. And when a thing is so largely proved already, and when a *satisfactory* prooffe of it in any one of the seven Cities is abundantly sufficient to the asserting of *Metropolitanes*, (for then the *Angel* of that one was a *Metropolitan*) 'tis then certainly a very incompetent confutation barely to say, that *it will hardly be proved, that these seven Cities were all of them Metropolitical Cities in Saint John's dayes*, for if it be proved, it matters not how *hardly*, and if any one were so in *S. John's dayes*, it matters not, if possibly some other were not, that one was a *Metropolitcal Angel*, which is all we need insist on.

7. And for the *Argument* to make it *improbable*, drawn from the *situation* of the Cities, that is as *infirm*; for this, as all other controversies of *matters of fact*, must be waged by *authorities* of those which were likely to *know* the truth, and to testifie aright, and to those we have all reason to *adhere*, and not to be moved by *arguments* that seeme probable to those that live 1600. yeares after, and are not perhaps so perfect *Masters* of the *Geographie* of the place as duly to be able to judge even what is in that respect most *probable*.

8. Nay for the distances of these Cities, though I have not now Mr. *Brightman* by me, yet my notes out of him tell me, that in his scale of *furlongs*, *Pergamus* was distant from *Smyrna* 540. *furlongs*, i. e. about 68. *English miles*, and *Ephesus* from *Smyrna* 320. i. e. about 40. miles, and *Thyatira* from *Pergamus* 80. *English miles*. which is a distance very reconcilable with their being *Metropoles*.

9. But they are content to *suppose* this was true, and then have *answers* ready another way, 1. That it is no good *argument* from the *greatnesse* of the Cities to *inferre* the *greatnesse* of the Churches, for though the Cities were *great*, yet the Churches were but *small*, and the number of *believers* very few in comparison of the rest of the people.

10. To this I reply, 1. by *concession*, that in all places and times the *greatnesse* of the Church cannot absolutely be concluded from the *greatnesse* of the City, because it is possible that a *great City* may have utterly resisted the *faith*, and a
lesser

lesser City received it; or againe a greater City, that hath received the Faith in some of the Members, may yet have fewer believers in it, than another City, which is not so great. This therefore is not our way of concluding, from the bare greatness of the Cities, to infer the great number of believers in them.

11. Our way of concluding is this; Paul had spent three yeares, *Act. 20. 31.* in this *Lydian* or *Proconsular Asia*, *ver. 18.* In this time he had pursued his worke very diligently and zealously, not ceasing to warne every one night and day with teares, and herein his harvest was proportionable to his labour; After two yeares space and upwards spent at *Ephesus*, it is said, *ver. 19.* that by the continuance of his preaching and gathering Disciples, all they that dwelt in *Asia*, heard the Word of the Lord both Jews and Greeks, and though many were hardened and believed not, and spake evil of that way, *ver. 9.* yet *ver. 17.* by some extraordinary workes of his, which were made knowne to all the Jews and Greeks dwelling at *Ephesus*, feare fell on them all, and the name of the Lord Jesus was magnified, a conversion in a manner general, and therefore it followes, and many that believed—*ver. 18.* and so mightily grew the word of God and prevailed, *ver. 20.* Whereupon Saint Paul himselfe speaking of these successes, calls it a great dore and an effectual, *1 Cor. 16. 9.* which at *Ephesus*, *v. 8.* was opened unto him.

12. From hence we conclude, and sure safely may, 1. that in *Asia* generally, and especially in *Ephesus* there was a great number of Christians, before this time of Christ's Epistle, (which is not a concluding it barely from the greatness of that or any other Cities of *Asia*) Secondly from hence, together with *Ephesus's* being in the secular account (the *Notitia Imperiales*) a *Metropolis*, where the *Affizes* were kept, we conclude that *Ephesus* was in the Christian account also a *Metropolis*, and the chiefe of all *Asia*; and this I hope is not so improbable infirme a way of concluding, as the other imposed on us seemed to be.

13. Thirdly, from hence, and from other exemplifications of it (as that *Trallis* and *Magnesia*, which appeare to be

under the *Metropolis of Ephesus*, are by *Ignatius* written to as all *Episcopal Sees*, in our present notion of the word *Bishop* we conclude that other Cities of *Asia* beside these seven, had received the *Christian* faith, and were certainly taken care for by *Paul*, which had planted it among them, and agreeably had *Rulers* settled in them, i. e. *Bishops* subordinate to the *Metropolitans*. And all these inferences I doubt not will appear regular enough, and I should farther enlarge on them, if there were any thing in the answer, which could render it needful or seasonable.

14. As for the paucity of *Christians* in those times in comparison of the rest of the people, that cannot be pertinently opposed to our pretensions, because still the number of *Christians* in a great City might beare the same proportion to the number of the *Christians* in the smaller Cities, that the people in the one did to the people in the other, one thousand bearing the same proportion to one hundred, that an hundred thousand doth to ten thousand.

15. And it being the affirmation of *Clemens*, that the *Apostles* in each City, where they received any *profelytes*, though never so few, before their parting constituted a *Bishop* (with his *Deacon*) who was to be governor τῶν μελλόντων πιστέων, of those that should after believe, it follows unquestionably from thence, that in the Cities which had but few *Christians*, *Bishops* might be and were constituted, and those very regularly depending on the greater (their *Metropolitans*) Cities, from whence the faith was derived to them, (as from *Ephesus*, where *Paul* chiefly resided, to the Cities about it) and all this without any need of ballancing the parties, or considering what comparison the number of the *Christians* in one, or the other, bore to the number of the *unbelievers* in either City. And let this serve by way of Reply to the first branch of the second answer.

Section X V I.

Of modelling Churches according to the Government of the Roman state. Of exemplars of Metropolitans among the Jewes. Testimonies of the Apostles instituting Metropolitans.

THeir second answer is, we doe not believe that ever it can be proved that the Apostles did modell the Government of the Church, according to the Government of the Roman state. This was the after policy of Christian Emperours and Bishops, but no part of Apostolicall policy; And therefore it doth not follow, that because there were divers Cities under the iurisdiction of those 7. Cities, that therefore there should be divers Churches subordinate to the 7. Asian Churches. Numb. 1.

2. That the Apostles, which designed to plant a Church in the Heathen World, should doe it in that manner as would be most advantageous to their end, will not I hope be accounted strange. This generally was by betaking themselves to the Cities, rather than the villages, and first to the greater Cities, unto which was the most frequent resort, that by that means the faith might be most compendiously and successfully propagated. If a greater City resisted their preaching, or fewer Saints were gathered there, I do not then pretend to prove, or to believe that that was constituted a Metropolitan Church with superiority over others of greater antiquity, or larger growth in the faith, whatsoever the dignity of it were in the secular account; But when a whole Nation is converted, and the greatest and most populous Cities first, and from thence the sound gone out into all the Region, and lesser Cities in it, that then the Apostles, which certainly constituted Bishops in every believing City (and therefore what is reported to have been done *κατ' ἐκκλησίαν* in every Church, Acts 14.23. is appointed to be done *κατὰ πόλιν* in every City, Tit. 1.5) should set up the principall Sees in those most Christian Cities, which had formerly the priority in the Romane state, as it is the wisest method, and fittest for the wisest planters to take, so we have all reason to believe it was done particularly in the

Lydian or *Proconsular Asia*, in which there being many more *Christian Cities*, than those *seven*, to whom *Christ's Epistle* is addrest, those are in all reason to be accounted the chiefe of that *Region*, and those which are not named, lesse principall than they; which concurring with what we finde recorded in *Pliny* and *Prolomy* of the account of them in the imperiall noticia, if it demonstrate not, is yet matter of exceeding great probability, and may perswade with any reasonable man, as long as there is nothing in any degree such, which is offered to be confronted against it.

3. If that which scandalizeth the *Assemblers* (for we are left to *Divine* what it is) be the unfitnessse that the *Apostles* should modell the *Church* according to the *Roman state*. I shall first demand how it is possible to imagine a plantation of a *Church* in any, whether *Jewish* or *Heathen state*, without doing somewhat equivalent to this? For suppose *Joseph of Arimathea* to have (as * *Gildas* saith) converted the *Britannick church* in *Tiberius's* time, is it to be imagined that he should meddle with the civill power of this Nation, as it stood in respect of it's separation from other Nations, toto divisa Orbe, or with the divisions or distributions of this Nation within it selfe, into *Cities*, and *Provinces*, &c. or goe about to innovate any thing in that matter? Is it not certaine that it was no part of the *Christian faith* to be such a judge or divider; but on the other side that all should remaine as it did (in that respect) before the coming of *Christianity*? And therefore supposing 1. That this Nation were governed by a *King* of its own; is it not certaine that this nationall Church should follow the boundaries of the Nation, and so be modelled according to the government of the (formerly *Heathen*) *Britannick state*? And supposing againe (what hath already been proved by the testimony of *Clemens*, and by comparing *Act. 14. 23.* with *Tit. 1. 5.*) that a *Bishop* were constituted in every Church, in each City, will there be any reason of doubting but that those *Cities* being subordinate one to another, according to the customes of the Nation, the Churches in those *Cities*, and the Bishops in those Churches shall be so also? This I hope will not be deemed an impious compliance with

* De excid. &
Conqu. Brit.

with heathenisme, or conformity with the World, nay, though the Emperour of Rome (by his conquests here) were the author of these distributions.

4. But then secondly, it is already cleared in the *Dissertations*, that this Ecclesiastick division of Cities into Mothers and Daughters, Metropoles and inferior Cities, was by the Apostle copied out from the Jewes, as when God commands by Moses, that Judges and Officers should be ordained in every City, Deut. 16. 18. and that in matters of weight and doubt they should resort to Jerusalem, to the Judge and Sanhedrim there, according to which it appears that Jerusalem was the Metropolis of those other Cities, and so is evident, Act. 9. by the story of Saul carrying Letters of Commission from the Sanhedrim there to the consistories in Damascus, and by many other evidences. So likewise Numb. 3. when three Families of the Levites, the sonnes of Aaron, were separated for the service of the Tabernacle, and an head or Prince or President of every of these, called נשיא v. 24. 30. 35. Eleazar Aaron's Sonne is constituted over all these, and styled נשיא נשיא the head of the heads of the Levites, This is clearly a patterne of the Metropolitanes in the Christian Church, which may therefore owne it's derivation from thence, and not from the Heathen models of Government, which yet it was not reasonably to disturbe, being found so concordant to, and commodious for it.

5. And that what was done in this kind, was done by the Apostles themselves and Apostolicall persons, the first founders of Churches, and not onely by the after policy (as is suggested) of Christian Emperours and Bishops, might have appeared abundantly by these few testimonies, if they had been worthy to be taken notice of. First, of the councell of Nice An. Domini 325. not many yeares after the conversion of Constantine, the first Christian Emperour, Can. 6. which takes care for the preserving the priviledges of the Metropolitanes (by name that the Bishop of Alexandria should have power over the Churches in Egypt, Lybia and Pentapolis, that in Antioch and the rest of the Provinces τα πρεσβυτα αὐξενδια ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις, the priveleges should be preserved to the

the Churches) begins with this rule τὰ ἀρχαία ἔδν καλῶνται, Let the antient customes continue in force, which certainly refers to that which was long before the Christian Emperours, and (without any reason of doubting) to the first constitutions of those Churches by St. Marke, and St. Peter, and then the Canon goes on to exact this by way of conformity with other places, with Rome it selfe; Επειδὴ δὲ τὸ ἐν τῇ Ῥώμῃ ἐπακρότερον τοῦ οὐνοῦ ἐστίν, for this is the custome of force with the Bishop of Rome, and upon these grounds the Canon requires καθόλου universally, that if any man be made a Bishop χωρίς γνώμης τῆς Μητροπολίτου, without the judgement of the Metropolitan, he ought not to be Bishop—

6. So in the 9. Canon of the Councell of Antioch, in the year 341. which begins thus, that the Bishop, which presides in the Metropolis, ought to know the Bishops in every Province, and to take care of the whole Province, διὰ τὸ ἐν τῇ Μητροπόλει πάντας ἔχειν σωτρίχην πάντας τὰς τὰ πρὸς γύματα ἔχουσας, because all that have businesse, resort from all sides to the Metropolis (which is the very thing we now contend, to be the reason of conforming the Ecclesiastick to the civil models) and then proceeds to forbid other Bishops acting any thing of such a nature without him, this is backt with these words, κατὰ τὸν ἀρχαῖον καλῶντα τῶν πατέρων ἡμῶν κανόνα, according to the antient Canon of our Fathers, which hath been in force, referring againe to the immemoriall custome of all Churches since the first plantation, and not the after-politic of Christian Emperours and Bishops, as is here suggested.

7. Lastly, in the last canon of the Great councell of Ephesus, in the year 431. (which is the defining a speciall matter of Metropolitall right) where the occasion of the controversie is rehearsed, how the Bishop of Antioch invaded the privileges of the Cypriots, contrary to the ἀρχαῖον ἔδν the antient custome, and the decree is made that the Bishops of Cyprus shall retaine them inviolate, κατὰ τὸς κανόνας τῶν ἁγίων πατέρων, καὶ τῶν ἀρχαίων συνήθειαν, according to the Canons of the Holy Fathers, and the antient custome; The Canon extends it selfe to all other Dioceses and Provinces, that no Bishop

shop shall meddle with another Province in ἑκατ ἀνωθεν καὶ ἐξ ἀρχῆς τοῦ αὐτοῦ ἡγῶν τὰν πρὸ αὐτοῦ χλῆρα, which was not upward and from the beginning under his, i. e. his predecessors power, where it is most evident that the Metropolitick power, and primacy Ecclesiasticall is derived from the beginning of the plantation of each Church, and consequently that this was a part of Apostolicall policy, and not onely an after policy of Christian Emperours, &c.

8. And upon these grounds of probation, I shall be competently secured that this is proved, which they doe not believe ever can be, and have no other argument to prove their negative, but their not believing the affirmative.

Section XVII.

Of the objection against Metropoles from the seven Starres in seven Churches.

OF the same temper is their third answer, that they are fully Num. 1. assured that it can never be made out, that any of these Asian Angels were Archbishops or Bishops over other Bishops, or Bishops over divers settled Churches. The seven Starres are said in Scripture to be fixed in their seven Candle-sticks or Churches, not one Starre over divers Candle-sticks or Churches.

2. What they are already fully assured of, that it can never be made out, I shall have little confidence to persuade them. was formerly done to their hands; Otherwise I should hope that by what had long since been said, and hath now been more largely deduced in Reply to their last answer, they might find cause to alter their judgements, and retract their so definitive sentence of full assurance.

3. As for the onely appearance of reason, which is here superadded, viz. that the seven Stars are found fixed in seven, not one over divers Churches, this I conceive not to be of any force. For it being by us granted and presumed that each of the seven Asian Angels was Bishop of his particular Church, one of Ephesus, another of Smyrna, &c. It is perfectly reconcilable

citeable herewith, that in case these *seven* were not the onely Cities and Churches in *Asia* (as it is certaine they were not, all *Asia*, consisting of *many* more Cities, being before this converted to the Faith) all the other might have dependance on these *seven*.

4. For this we know, that two *Bishops* in *England*, that were each of them, first in one *City*, for example in *Canterbury* or *Torke*, had yet each of them a *superiority* or *Metropolitick* power over divers other Cities, and when any *Record* styles one of them *Bishop* of *Canterbury*, as the *Scripture* doth *Angel* of *Ephesus*, we should sure acknowledge it a very infirme inference from the words of that *Record*, to conclude that being *Bishop* of *Canterbury* he could not be *Metropolitan* of *London*, *Rochester*, &c.

5. And this is the very parallel to the present instance, and if it were not *invalid* enough, by being a bare *negative* argument [*they are not said in Scripture to be one Starre over divers Churches*] (all things that *are*, are not *said* in *Scripture*, those *Angels* have not therefore no *names*, because they are not there recorded) this parallel instance, which supposes the *contrary* to their pretensions, would be sufficient to *invalidate* it.

Section X V I I I.

Of the use of the word Bishop for Archbishop in Tertullian: Of Angel in Christs Epistle.

Numb. 1.

A Fourth answer, or rather confutation, is added, That if this opinion were true, then Tertullian did not doe well in saying that St. John made Polycarpe Bishop of Smyrna, but he should rather have said that he made him Archbishop. And our Saviour Christ had not given to these seven Angels their due Titles, for he must have written to the Angel of the Church of Ephesus, together with all those Churches in the Cities subordinate to Ephesus. And so likewise of the other six.

2. To this I reply, that the affirming the *seven Angels* to have been *Metropolitans*, no way obligeth us to find fault either

either with *Tertullians* or our *Saviour's* style. Not with *Tertullian's*, for 1. an *Arch-Bishop* is a *Bishop*, though dignified above some others of that order. Secondly, supposing *Smyrna* to be a *Metropolis* (as no doubt, if it were, *Tertullian* knew and supposed it to be) then his styling *Polycarp Bishop of Smyrna*, is equivalent to his calling him a *Metropolitan* or *Archbishop*. As acknowledging *Canterbury* to be a *Metropolitick See* in *England*, the affirming *William Laud* to be constituted *Bishop of Canterbury*, is all one, as to affirm him *Archbishop*.

3. Thus when * *Chrysostome* saith of *Titus*, that ὁλόκληρος νῆτος καὶ τῶν ἐπισκόπων κείτοι, an intire Island and the judgement of so many Bishops was committed to him, what is this but to affirm *Titus Arch-bishop of Crete*? And yet * *Eusebius*, who believed this, and adverted to it, as much as *Chrysostome*, uses this phrase, τῶν ἐν Κρήτῃ ἐκκλησιῶν ἐπισκοπῶν εἰληφέναι, that he was *Bishop of the Churches of Crete*, calling him *Bishop* distinctly, though by the mention of the *Churches* in the plural, 'tis evident he meant the same that we doe by *Arch-Bishop*.

* In Tit. 1.
Hom. 1.

* Lib. 3. cap. 4.

4. So againe * *Eusebius of Irenaeus*, that he τὰς κατὰ Γαλιλίας παρειαίας ἐπισκόπων, was *Bishop of the Provinces of France*, which must needs signifie *Archbishop of Lyons*, for so he was. And 'tis certaine that other of the *Antients* use the word Ἀρχιεπίσκοπος *Arch-Bishop*, of those which were no otherwise qualified for that title, as when *Saint Cyprian* the *Bishop of Carthage*, under which the whole *Province of Africk* is comprehended, is by the * *Council of Constantinople* called Ἀρχιεπίσκοπος τῆς Ἀφρικανικῆς, *Arch-Bishop of the region of Africk*.

* Lib. 5. cap. 23.

* In Trallo.
can. 2.

5. The same answer will competently suffice, for the reconciling *Christ's* style and ours, for supposing *Ephesus* to have been a *Metropolis*, the writing to the *Angel* of that *Church*, implies writing to those other *Churches* in the *Cities* subordinate to *Ephesus*, and need not be more fully exprest, as when the *Apostle* wrote to the *Church of Corinth*, and not onely so, but to all the *Saints* (and so all the *Churches*) in all *Achaia*. 2 Cor. 1. 1. 'tis certaine that the former *Epistle* was

written to those very same Churches (viz. all under the Metropolis of Corinth) and yet it is inscribed to the Church of God which is at Corinth, 1 Cor. 1. 1. without mentioning of Achaia, save onely in a general indefinite phrase, with all that in every place call on the name of Jesus.

6. Secondly, the word in Christ's Epistle being not Bishop but Angel, is not at all lyable to this exception, For why may not an Arch-Bishop be as fitly called an Angel, as a Bishop would be? nay if it be remembred what was formerly cited out of Clemens Alexandrinus, Strom. 6. that there are seven Angels which have the greatest power, by him styled ἄγγελοι ἄρχοντες, the first-borne rulers of the Angels; parallel to the phrase in Dan. 7. 10. 13. שרים הראשנים the head, Lords or chiefe Princes, or, as we ordinarily stile them, the Archangels, of which number Michael is there named to be one, There will then be more than a tolerable propriety of speech in Christ's stile, a most exact critical notation of their being Arch-Bishops, and withall a farther account of Tertullian's calling Polycarp a Bishop of Smyrna, though he were Arch-Bishop, just as the Archangels in Daniel are more than once called Angels in the Revelation.

7. For a close of this mater they are pleased to adde their Character, not over-benigne of those by whom this device, as they stile it, was found out for the honour of Archepiscopacy, [that they did aspire unto that dignity.]

8. If hereby be meant the Lord Primate of Ireland in his discourse of the Original of Bishops, this character can have no propriety in it, he having quietly enjoyed that dignity many yeares before the writing hereof. If it be designed for a reproach to me, I shall elude the blow by not thinking it such. For as at a time when Episcopacy it selfe was by the Parliament abolisht, (and that Act of severity actually put in execution) it had been a great folly in any to hope that he should ever attaine to that Office of Dignity in the Church, (and what ever other follies I have been guilty of, truly that was none of them) so I thinke there could not a point of time more commodiously have been chosen in the space of above 1600. yeares, wherein a man might have better secured.

cured a *Discourse* for *Bishops* and *Metropolitans*, from the *Censure* of aspiring to either of those *Dignities*, than was that, wherein that Book was published.

9. To this if I adde by way of *retortion*, that it is evident that they which write this *Ius Divinum Ministerii Evangelici* doe aspire every one of them to their part of a *Ruling Presbytery*, which their *brethren* that have not those *Ambitions* are farre from thinking to have any *Divine Stamp* upon it, I shall have given an account of the unskilfulnesse of their *Reproaches*, as well as of the *invalidity* of their *Answers*.

10. As for the *fear* which their *Discourse* on this matter suggests to their more *moderate brethren*, that if a *Ius Divinum* be stamped on *Archbishops* and *Primates*, and *Patriarchs*, they may be forced by the same proportion to put a *Divine stamp* upon the *Pope* himselfe, I perswade my selfe that I have given the *ingenious reader* a satisfactory account of the inconsequence hereof, in a *Discourse* of *Schisme*, to which I shall refer him, if he need, or desire farther trouble or direction in this businesse.

Section XIX.

Of Division into *Parishes*, and Union into *Diocesses*. Of *Diocesan Bishops* in the *Apostles* dayes. *Elders* in every Church, *Act. 14*. *Elders* of the Church, *Act. 20*. That place vindicated from exception.

After all this, they adde a fourth (whether Answer or Numb. 1. *suppletory Consideration*) for the conclusion of this *Discourse* concerning the *Asian Angels*, and I shall follow them to that more cheerfully, because it lookes like a conclusion.

2. It is this, That it can never be proved that these *Asian Angels* were *Bishops* in a *Prælati*cal sense, much lesse *Arch Bishops* and *Metropolitans*. For it is believed upon all parts, that *believers* in great Cities, were not divided into set and fixe *Congregations* and *parishes*, till long after the *Apostles* dayes, and that

Parishes were not united into Dioceses till 260. years after Christ. And therefore sure we are that there could not be Diocessane Churches and Diocessane Bishops formerly so called in the Apostles dayes; These Angels were Congregationall, not Diocessan. In the beginning of Christianity the number of Believers, even in the great Cities were so few, that they might well meet ἐν τῷ αὐτῷ in the same place. And these were called the Church of the City, and therefore to ordaine Elders καὶ ἐκκλησίαν and κατὰ πόλιν, are all one in Scripture.

3. To the preface of this conclusion, that it cannot be proved —] it is againe very sufficient to answer, that when a proposition hath already been proved so farre, that no answer hath been rendred, which at all satisfies, or invalidates the force of the proofes, it is very unlike Artists to say, that it cannot be proved. Nay, although some inconvenience were producible, which would presse our assertion yet the old rule would require it's place, *incommodum non solvit argumentum*, the mention of an inconvenience insuing, doth not take off the force of an argument.

4. But we need not that warinesse here; the reason which is here annext to prove that it cannot be proved, is of no force against us, For 1. as Congregations and Parishes are *synonimous* in their style, so I yeild that Believers in great Cities were not at first divided into Parishes, while the number of the Christians in a City was so small, that they might well assemble in the same place, and so needed no partitions or divisions.

5. But what disadvantage is this to us, who affirme that one Bishop, not a College of Presbyters, presided in this one Congregation, and that the Believers in the Region and Villages about, did belong to the care of that single Bishop of the City-church? May not these be ruled by a Bishop as well before, as after the division into Parishes? Or is this division more necessary to the Government by one Bishop in each City, than to the Government of more Presbyters in every City? In all reason the division of this one into severall Parishes should make Presbyters more necessary after than before such division, that each Parish might have one Presbyter, to officiate

ficiate among them in things of daily use; and upon that account I suppose it was, that when the number of Believers was so farre increased, that all the Christians of a City could not meet commodiously in one place, and when the Regions and Villages so abounded with *Profelytes* that in respect of them also it was necessary, then the *Bishop* of each City thought fit to constitute *Presbyters*, in our moderne notion of them, many in every City, and many in every Region, one in every Village, though as yet the word *Parish*, in our moderne sense, was not come into the World.

6. And so this is farre from being *Argumentative* against us, it is rather usefull to confirme what is asserted by us, that it is against the whole *Scheme* which the Scriptures or first writers give us of Churches, to imagine that in every City there was by the *Apostles* a College of *Presbyters* constituted, when as they agree to assure us a *Bishop* and his *Deacon* were sufficient at the first (so thin) Plantations.

7. So againe when they take it for granted that *Parishes* were not united into *Dioceses* till 260. yeares after *Christ*; I shall aske 1. whether they were sooner divided into *Classes*, &c. and if not, what they have gained to their *Jus Divinum* by this observat on?

8. But then secondly, 'tis cleare that there might be *Dioceses* before this division into *Parishes*, in our moderne notion; For what is a *Diocese* but a *Church* in a *City* with the *Suburbs* and *Territorie* or *Region* belonging to it? And this certainly might be, and remaine under the *Government* of a single *Bishop*, as well before, as after any more minute distributions into such, as we now call *Parishes*.

9. For it is one thing for the *Church* of this *City* to be divided from the *Church* of every other *City*; another thing for the same *Church* to be divided into many *Assemblies*; The first is it which is required for the setting up of *Government*; and of any such *Church* so bounded there may be a *Bishop*, and that whole *Church* shall be his *Diocese*, and so he a *Diocesan Bishop*, though as yet this *Church* be not subdivided into more severall *Assemblies*.

10. And therefore when they adde, that there could not

be Diocesan Churches and Bishops formerly so called in the Apostles dayes, unlesse they have some little equivocation in the word *Diocesan*, It is most certaine they have no reason on which to found their confidence, For that there was a Church in each City, and it's territory (howsoever governed by one or more) is most certaine, and equally affirmed by them and us, and equally their interest and ours, that it be affirmed. As for the use of the word *Διοκηνσις*, that hath oft varied, and hath sometimes been of a larger, sometimes of a narrower signification, and so hath *Παροικια*, the originall of our *Parish* also, but I hope our contentions mult not be alwayes about words, when the matter is sufficiently agreed on among us, and the words sufficiently explained to expresse that matter.

11. And therefore when they adde these *Angels* were congregationall, not *Diocesan*, the reply is obvious, they were every of them *Angels* of a Church in a City, having authority over the Region adjacent, and pertaining to that City, and so as Church and Congregation are all one (as in ordinary use in all languages they are) they were Congregationall and *Diocesan* also.

12. What followes of the paucity of believers in the greatest Cities, and their meeting in one place, as also of a Church and City being all one, is willingly granted by us, and hath not the least appearance of being usefull to their pretentions, or hurtfull to ours, and therefore I have no temptation to make any the less Reply to it.

13. That which next followes, though it concerne us not to examine it, our interest being equally secured, be it true or false, yet I cannot but take some notice of it in passing, because it is a little extraordinary.

14. Afterwards, say they, we conceive that believers became so numerous in these great Cities, as that they could not conveniently meet in one place; Thus it was in the Church of Jerusalem, *Act.* 2. 41. and 4. 4. and 5. 14. and thus possibly it might be in most of these Asian Churches in St. John's time.

15. Here certainly the word [Afterwards] is relative, and
re.

refers to the *Antecedent* in the former Paragraph, and that is, [*In the beginning of Christianity*] Hereupon I demand, what time is that which they call [*the beginning of Christianity* ?] Is it that wherein Christ continued on the Earth ? If so, they will easily believe us, that we do not think, that *Diocesan* Bishops were placed in the Church, within that period. If it be the time immediately following the Resurrection of Christ, when the Apostles began to preach and propagate the Faith, then how come they to divide that time, which is spoken of *Act.* 2. 41. from that time of the *beginning of Christianity*, by this word [*Afterward*] for tis certain what is there storied of the 3000. Converts, is the effect of the first Sermon preached by any of the Apostles immediately upon the descent of the *Holy Ghost* upon them, and the gift of *Tongues*, the wonderment whereof brought those so many Auditors together.

16. So secondly when they say of this point of time, *Act.* 2. 41. *The believers were so numerous that they could not conveniently meet in one place*, This is contrary to the evidence of the *Text*, which saith expressly v 44. *That all the believers were ἐν τῷ αὐτῷ*, which in the last paragraph, they interpreted, *meeting in one and the same place*. The like might be said of the other places *Act.* 4. 4. and 5. 14. for certainly, as yet though the number of Believers increased, yet they were not distributed into severall Congregations. But this by the way, being assured that this disquisition is perfectly extrinsecall to the matter in debate betweene us, because as at *Jerusalem* the antients are cleare in affirming, that soone after Christ's Ascension, * *Peter* and *James* and *John* chose *James* the just, the Brother of the Lord, and constituted him Bishop of *Jerusalem*, which is all that we need pretend to from the story of that Church, so it matters not much at what point of time that was done, whether at the very beginning or afterwards, much lesse how soone it was that that Church was distributed into severall divided Assemblies, the Creation of the Bishop not at all depending on that, as hath formerly been shewed.

17. Hence will it appeare to, how very little purpose are those.

* Πέτρον, Ἰωάννην, καὶ Ἰάκωβον καὶ Ἰωάννην—μὴ ἐπιδιόκλειον, ὁ ὄνομα, ἀλλ' Ἰακώβον τὸ δικαίου ἐπισκοπον ἱεροσολύμων ἐλέσθαι. *Enseb. Eccl. Hist.* 1. 2. c. 1. *Ex. Clem. Apostolus*

πρωτ.

those *cautions* added, and *observations* made in the remaining part of this sixth Chapter.

18. Thus, say they, possibly it might be (i.e. the believers be so numerous in great Cities, that they could not conveniently meet in one place) in most of these Asian Churches in St. John's time. But yet notwithstanding all this, there are three things diligently to be observed; First, that these meeting places were frequented promiscuously and indistinctly, and that believers were not divided into set and fixed Churches or Congregations in the Apostles days.

19. But first I demand, Is there any truth in this observation? was not the Church of Jerusalem in the Apostles days a set and fixed Church, so as to be perfectly severed from the Church of Alexandria and Ephesus? Was not James the Brother of the Lord Bishop of the one, and not of the other?

20. Secondly, why was this for the Presbyterians interest to be so diligently observed? If one of these Churches were not thus divided and severed from others, how could it be governed by a Presbytery, as they pretend it was? Must it not be a determinate fixed body that is governed by any, whether Bishop or Presbyters? I profess not to be able to discern by my most diligent observation, why this was so necessary to be so diligently observed.

21. Secondly, (say they, it must be as diligently observed) that notwithstanding these different meeting places, yet the Believers of one City made but one Church in the Apostles days, as is evident in the Church of Jerusalem, which is called a Church not Churches, *Act*. 8. 1. & 15. 6. & 22. 16. And so likewise it is called the Church of Ephesus, and the Church of Thyatira, &c. not Churches, &c.

22. This Observation I acknowledge to have perfect truth in it, and not to be confutable in any part (save onely that the two latter Texts are certainly misquoted, and not rectified in the *Errata*) and therefore instead of rejecting, I shall imbrace it, and from thence conclude, that there is no manner of incongruity in assigning of one Bishop to one Church, and so one Bishop in the Church of Jerusalem, because it is

a Church not Churches, being forced to acknowledge that where there were more Churches there were more Bishops, and so likewise one Angel of Ephesus, and of Thyatira, &c. This I suppose was not the thing they meant to inferre from hence, nor indeed doe I conceive it necessarily inferred from (onely very agreeable to) the onenesse of each Church, without other arguments to joyne with it. But I am still to seek, and emand what advantage accrues to their cause, or disadvantage to ours by this observation?

23. But then thirdly they adde, that this Church in the City was governed in the Apostles dayes by the common councill of Presbyters or Bishops.

24. This indeed were worth their diligent observing, if it could be descried, and would abundantly recompence them for the no-profit their two former observations brought them in, if it could be obtained by all their diligence. But this being the τὸ ἐνέκλιον, the onely thing in question betwixt us, whether the Church in each City was in the Apostles dayes governed by the common councill of Presbyters or Bishops, or by one single Bishop, called sometimes πρεσβύτερος Elder (as that signifies simply a Governour, not with restriction, a member of a College of Governours) this I say being the onely question in debate betweene us, it must not be any farther yeilded to them, than their proofes and evidences will enforce it; And these of what virtue they are, must now appeare by the view of them. And the first they produce is this.

25. The Apostles went about ordeining Presbyters in every Church, Act. 14. 23.

26. But surely this is an infirme argument. Every Church signifies without question more Churches than one, viz. Derbe, Lystra, Iconium, Antioch, v. 20. 21. And if in each of those one πρεσβύτερος be supposed to be ordeined, that certainly will satisfie the importunity of that Text, and the mention of πρεσβύτερος Elders in the plurall, viz. foure Elders in those so many Churches. And if because ἐκκλησία is in the singular number, they therefore thinke that those plurall Elders must be ordeined in each of those Churches. This is too grosse a

mistake for *Scholars* to be guilty of, it being certaine that that is not the importance of the phrase καὶ ἐκκλησίαι, any more than of the English [Church by Church] or [in every Church] i.e. more Elders in more Churches, one in every one.

27. Their next prooffe is from *Act. 20. 17*. Paul called for the Elders of the Church of Ephesus (one of these seven Churches) and calls them Bishops, and commits the whole government of the Church to them; The like may be said of the other six Churches.

28. What may be said of Ephesus, I grant may be said of the other six Churches, but the Text no where affirms it of Ephesus, and so the analogy will no way prove it of the rest. All that the Text saith, is this, And from Miletus he sent to Ephesus and called the Elders of the Church. This is not to say the Elders (as that signifies Presbyters in our moderne notion) of the one City, and so Church of Ephesus, but the Elders, i.e. Bishops either of the Asian Church of that whole Region, or at least of the Ephesine Province, the neighbouring Bishops of the Churches or Cities that were under that Metropolis of Ephesus, who by St. Paul's sending his summons to Ephesus, the chiefe City of the one, and chiefe Metropolis of the other (which consequently had daily meanes of communicating intelligence to those other Cities) might thus most commodiously be advertised of St. Paul's coming, and provide to meet him at Miletus.

29. That this is no strain'd interpretation or answer, is elsewhere evidenced, and may summarily appeare by these two testimonies, one of Irenaeus here formerly mentioned, l. 3. c. 14. ab Epheſo & reliquis proximis civitatibus convocatos esse, that they were called from Ephesus and the rest of the neereſt Cities adjoining to it, This is an expresse evidence, which being allowed puts the whole matter out of question. And although in a matter of fact, a testimony of so credible a person that lived so neere the times, being an auditoir of Polycarpe the first Bishop of Smyrna, and is not contradicted by any contemporary, is of a competent authority, and need not any other Topickes to assist it, yet for the removing all possible

possible prejudices from it, and rendring it yet more *indubitable*, I shall a little farther enlarge for the confirming of it.

30. And 1. the *Apostle* at his meeting with them, v. 18. begins in this style, *ye know from the first day that I came into Asia, after what manner I have been with you at all seasons*; An addresse to them, either as to the *Elders* of *Asia* indefinitely, as many as could conveniently come to *Miletus* at that time, or at least as to more than to the *Elder* (or *Elders*, if that could be truly pretended) of one City of *Asia*, peculiarly, or *exclusively* to all others.

31. So againe v. 25. *And now behold I know that ye all, among whom I have gone preaching the Kingdome of God, shall see my face no more*; This evidently addressees the speech not onely to the inhabitants of one City, but to all those (as many as were then present) among whom hee had gone preaching the Faith of *Christ*, and that we know was done by him to the other Cities, and not onely to that of *Ephesus*, καὶ τὸν πᾶσιν τὸν αὐτῷ ἐπαγγελίᾳ διαλεχθῶν κύκλον, in passage (though not so solemnly as at *Ephesus*) going through all the Region and preaching the Gospel to all, saith *Oecumenius* on 2 *Joh*. And so tis expressly said *Act*. 19. 21. that after the two yeares and three moneths spent at *Ephesus*, ἐν ἧτι χρόνῳ οὐκ ὀλίγῳ, he staid and spent some time in *Asia*, And accordingly v. 26. *Demetrius* truly saith, that not onely at *Ephesus* but almost throughout all *Asia*, Paul had perswaded and turned away the people.

32. Secondly, then the Faith being before this time successfully propagated through all *Asia*, and not onely in this one City of *Ephesus*, there were without question Churches accordingly gathered and compacted in many other Cities, as well as in *Ephesus*, before this time of *Paul's* parting never to see them againe. And not onely in the other *Metropolis*, (six more of which are owned by the *Objectors*, *Smyrna* and the rest *Rev*. 1.) but also in the lesser Cities, which were not *Metropolitick*, and yet more especially in those Cities which were neere *Ephesus*, and which as belonging to that *Metropolis*, had frequent resort thither to the *Assises* which

were there kept *Act. 19. 38.* and so must be supposed to have received speciall influences from the *Apostle's* residing there for the space of *two yeares and three moneths, Act. 19. 8. 10.*

33. To which purpose it must againe be remembred, that as *Timothy* is by *Eusebius* styled *τῆς ἐν Ἐφέσῳ πρεσβυτέρου ἐπισκοπῆς*, *Bishop of the Province that belongs to Ephesus, 1. 3. c. 4.* which is all one as to make that a *Metropolis* over other *Cities*, and accordingly in the order of *Metropolitickall Sees* at the end of *Codinus*, the *Bishop of Ephesus* is called *ἐπὶ Ἐφέσῳ, ὑπάρχοντι, καὶ Ἐξάρχοντι πάντων Ἀσίας*, *Primate of all Asia*, so *Ignatius* in *Trajan's* time is by joynt consent of the antients affirmed to have written *Epistles* to two *Churches*, *Magnesia* and *Trallis*, which are known to be *Cities* under this *Metropolis* of *Ephesus*, and to have named the *Bishops* of each, *Damas* of the one, and *Polybius* of the other.

34. And as there is no question among any but that *Ignatius* wrote such *Epistles* to those *Churches* (*Salmasius* cites that to the * *Trallians* expressly as the *Epistle* of *Ignatius*, which certainly he would never have done, if he had doubted whether ever *Ignatius* wrote to them; and indeed all that is questioned by him and *D. Blondell* is but this, whether the *Epistles* now extant under his name be genuine or no, not whether *Ignatius*, as all writers accord, wrote seven *Epistles*, of which these which we now speake of, are two) so there is no ground of imagining that they were of a later plantation, than that which is here recorded to be wrought by *St. Paul*, *Act. 19.* *All Asia* having then heard the Faith, *v. 10.* and received it in a remarkable manner *v. 20.* and a great dore, faith *St. Paul* being opened to him at *Ephesus* peculiarly, which must needs have influence on the *Cities* next adjoyning to it in a speciall manner.

35. To this I shall adde thirdly; that as * *Aristides* saith of *Ephesus*, that it was *ταμειὸν κοινὸν τῆς Ἀσίας*, the common magazine or store-house of *Asia*, καὶ τῆς χάριτος καὶ ἀστυν, their refuge for all manner, so it must needs be the fittest way of conveying intelligence speedily to all the *Cities* of *Asia*, especially the *proxima civitates*, as *Irenaeus* said, the *Cities* next adjoy-

* *Analectum
et Clementem
Petri Ministros
facit Ignatius
in Epistola ad
Trollenses. Wal.
Me p. 222.*

* *Or ad Afist.
Cru. de concord.*

adjoyning, and so most commodious to assemble those other Bishops to Paul at Miletus, and not only him, or those that are supposed to have resided at Ephesus.

36. And accordingly we finde in Eusebius, that the Epistle of Antoninus *ius* concerning the Christians, which was to be communicated to all Asia, *περὶ ἐκείνου ἐν ἑορτῇ ἐν τῷ κοινῷ τῆς Ἀσίας*, was proclaimed or divulged at Ephesus, in the common meeting of Asia, as the readiest way to make it universally knowne. Eccel. Hist. l. 4. c. 23.

37. All which being premised, and withall that there is no reason to imagine, that St. Paul at the time of his small parting, (taking his solemn last leave) of them v. 38. should not so much consider, as to call for, or desire to see any of the rest of his *Sonnes*, the Governours of the Inferiour Churches, to whom he had committed that numerous flock (which was now so universally in such danger of Wolves) save onely those of the one Church, of that one City of Ephesus (supposing there had been more than one there.) This will be a very competent confirmation of Irenæus his testimony, that indeed thus it was, as he hath delivered, that the Bishops of the Cities neereſt adjoyning to Ephesus. (as many as by summons from thence could speedily be called together, in all reason the Bishops of the Cities which were under that Metropolis) were sent to meet the Apostle at Miletus, and accordingly met him there.

38. The second testimony is that maxime of the Greeke Scholiast on 1 Pet. i. 5. *Πρεσβύτεροι γὰρ τὰς ἐκκλησίας ἢ τῶν πρεσβυτέρων βίβλος οἷον λεγόμενος*. The Booke of the Acts calls the Bishops Elders, which being avow'd by me in the Dissertations, and cleared through all the places in the Acts, they ought, by all Lawes of disputing, either to have endeavoured the refuting of what is there said, or the proving that *Πρεσβύτεροι* Elders must needs there signifie Presbyters in the moderne notion, which having not here attempted to doe, there is no kinde of force in what is here dictated, nothing said but what had beene long since largely and clearly answered.

39. Yet because in the next Chapter, where this place of

the Acts is viewed againe, one argument I see produced in favour of their *pretensions*, which they found in an *observation* of mine, I shall thinke my selfe concern'd to give an account of it.

40. It is this, Pag. 85. *If the Apostle by the Elders of the Church had meant the Bishops of the Church of all Asia, he would have said, not the Elders of the Church, but of the Churches. It is an observation made use of by one of those that makes use of this answer we are now confuting, That when the Scripture speaks of Churches in Cities it alwayes useth the singular number, as the Church of Jerusalem, the Church of Corinth, &c. but when it speaks of provinces where there are many Cities, then it useth the plurall number, as the Churches of Judæa, and the Churches of Asia, Rev. 1. 11. According to this observation, if the Apostle had meant of the Bishops of all Asia, he would have said the Elders of the Churches, whereas he calls them Elders of the Church, v. 17. and so must meane the Elders of the Church of Ephesus, and so meere Presbyters, not Bishops.*

41. But herein is a manifest mistake; For the observation is not made as is here suggested, of Churches in Cities and Provinces, that the former of them are constantly to be understood where there is mention of a Church in the singular number (without any name of particular City added to it) and that when a Province is mention'd, 'tis alwayes done by Churches in the plurall number; This is the sense on which their argument is founded. But if the Reader consult the *Dissertations* p. 190. He shall finde there is no such thing, 'tis onely this, That in the *New Testament* there is mention made of Churches in the plurall number, the Churches of Judæa, of Samaria, of Galilee, of Syria, of Cilicia, of Galatia, of Asia, of Macedonia, whereas in other places there was as frequent mention of a Church in the singular, the Church in Jerusalem, in Antioch, in Cenchrea, in Corinth, of the Thessalonians, of Ephesus, of Smyrna, of Pergamus, of Thyatira, of Sardis, of Laodicea.

42. The cause of that difference is there said to be this, that Judæa, &c, was the name of a Province, in which there being

being many Cities, there were consequently many Churches and Bishops in them, whereas one City with the *territory* adjoining to it being ruled by one *single Bishop*, was to be called a *singular Church*, and therefore that which is said to be done in *every Church*, Acts 14.13. is said to be done in *every City*. Tit. 1.5. The sum of which observation is onely this, that one City, with the *territory* adjoining to it never makes above one Church in the *Scripture* style, whereas a *Province* or *Country*, or *Nation* consists of *many Cities*, and so of many *Episcopall Sees* or Churches.

43. This was all that was said in that place, or that was usefull to be said in order to the end (to shew the *Original* of *Metropolitans*) there. And what a wresting of a plaine obvious observation is it, to conclude it from hence to be my *assertion*, that *when* (that must be, *whensoever*, or else the *conclusion* cannot be deducible from it) *the Scripture speaks of a Province, it is in the plurall number*? It doth sometimes do so, and that was all that was usefull to me. If it had done so but once, though twenty times it had done the contrary, it had been sufficient (for some reasonable account there must be for the doing it *once*, and what could that be, but the *number* of the Cities and so of Churches in each *Province* or *Nation*) much more when there were so *many* examples of it.

44. But this is not to *affirme* that it alwayes doth so, especially when being left at large without any restraint, not the Church of *Ephesus*, or the like, but *indefinitely* the Church, it is very capable of another *interpretation*. For sure when I wrote that, I had not forgotten my *Creede*, or in it the name *Church* in the *singular* number, which by the adjunct of *Catholike* must needs be more than the Church of one City. And having read *Mat. 16*. where the whole Church of *Christ* is called *my Church* in the *singular*, a like phrase to that of the *Church of God*, which the Bishops here are commanded to *feed*, and in the one *Epistle* to the *Ephesians* having *six* examples of the word *Church* in the *singular*, each signifying evidently the *universall Church*, I might very well be allowed to discern the word *Church* in the *singular*, without any

any addition of *Ephesus* or the like, which restrains it in all the *examples* there produced, to be applicable to a farre larger body, than the *Church* of one City, and consequently be quit from all obligation of making the *Elders* of the *Church*, *Act. 20. 17.* the *Elders* of the one City of *Ephesus*.

45. There is little doubt I suppose but the *Church* of the whole World, consisting of many *Churches*, as the parts thereof, may be, and is in *Scripture* called the *Church* in the singular, and so certainly may the *Church* of a *Nation* or a *Province*, especially if it be united together under one *Primate* or *Metropolitane*, as it is certaine the *Churches* and *Cities* neer *Ephesus*, nay over all *Asia* were, according to the plaine words of *St. Chrysostome*, who when * others affirme of *Timo:hy* that he was by *Paul* ordained *Bishop* of the *Metropolis* of *Ephesus*, expresseth the same thing thus, *Ἀλλὰν ὅτι ἐκκλησίαν λοιπὴν ὡς ἑμπειρευμένην ὁ Τιμόθεος, ἢ καὶ ἐθνὸν ὁλόκληρον τὸ τῆς Ἀσίας*, It is manifest that *Timothy* had a *Church* committed to him, or indeed an intire *Nation*, that of *Asia*. The like is ordinarily observable of *Crete*, a whole *Island* with an hundred *Cities* in it (in each of which *Titus* was appointed to ordeine a *Bishop* or *Elder*) which yet is styled in the subscription of the *Epistle* to *Titus*, ἢ τῶν Κρητῶν ἐκκλησία, the *Church* of *Crete*, and the subscription never questioned upon that score by any, that it spake improperly herein.

46. And consequently there can be no harshnesse in this interpretation, *Paul* sent to *Ephesus* and call'd the *Elders* of the *Church* to come to him to *Miletus*, and in his *Oration* addrest to them called them *Bishop* of the flock and of the *Church* of *God*, meaning them singular *præsents* of severall *Cities* of the *Church* of *Asia*, especially of those which were neerest *Ephesus*, the chiefe *Metropolis* of the whole *Nation*.

47. And so much in answer to that *Objection*, in defence of their argument from the *Elders* of *Ephesus*, as they call them.

48. Another *proofe* of the same is there added *Pag. 85.* Thus, *The Syriack translation* reads it, he sent to *Ephesus*,
and

* Τιμόθεος
ἐπὶ τὸ μέγα-
λον Παῖδα
χρῆστον· οὗτος
τῶν ἑρ-
σίων μνηστὴρ
λέως· Ἐπίσκο-
πος. Anon.
ap. Phot.
num. 2 54.

and called the Elders of the Church of Ephesus, so Hierome, *Presbyteros Ecclesia Ephesina*, so *concilium Aquisgranense*.

49. What authority St Hierome's testimony is to carry with us in this matter, hath been elsewhere largely shewed, and we may hereafter have farther occasion to declare it, and our reasons of it. At the present it is willingly confest that St. Hierome on *Tit.* 1. doth indeavour to prove that in *Scripture*, Bishop and Presbyter is the same, and from him *Isidore Hispalensis de officiis Eccl.* 1. 2. hath the same, and both have according to that *prolepsis* changed the words of the *Text* in the Acts, and instead of what there we read, sent to Ephesus and called the Elders of the Church, they read, sent to Ephesus and called the Elders of the same Church, expressing themselves to meane of the Church of Ephesus. And the councell of Aken (*Aquisgranense*) having transcribed nine Chapters from *Isidore verbatim*, consequently doe the like. So that the authority of *Isidore* and that councell being as great as St. Hierome can make it, from whom evidently it proceeds, may yet be allowed to yeild to the farre greater authority of *Polycarp's auditor Irenaeus*, who hath sufficiently cleared it to the contrary.

50. As for the Syriack translation, it is not here recited exactly accordingly to the truth, For in that, thus the words lie: *וְנָה מוֹ מִלֵּי טוֹס שָׂרָר אִתִּי לְקִשּׁוּשָׁא רַעְרָתָא רַחֲפָסוֹס*. And from Miletus he sent and called for the Elders of the Church of Ephesus, where is but one mention of Ephesus, not two, as is here suggested from the translation, that it reads, he sent to Ephesus and called the Elders of the Church of Ephesus. The short of it is, Ephesus being but once named in that verse, the Greeke placeth it in the beginning *ἀπὸ Μιλήτου ἀπέμπετο εἰς Ἐφεσόν*, from Miletus he sent to Ephesus, and this being the Originall must certainly over-rule all translations, and accordingly all translations but one to read it, onely the Syriack hath mis-placed the word Ephesus, put it in the later part of the period, quite against all *Syntaxis*, and for doing so, are here cited, and their testimony made use of to assist Presbytery, when the manifest truth in the

Originall, and by all other translations acknowledged, would not allow them any the least advantage.

51. After they had produced these two arguments, to prove that the Church in the City was governed in the Apostles days by a Common-councell of Presbyters, the Reader would hardly expect that which now next follows in these words.

From all this we gather, that the Asian Angels were not Dissentan Bishops, but congregationall Presbyters, seated each of them in one Church, not any of them in more than one.

52. This conclusion, as the words lie, consists of two parts, 1. That each of these Asian Angels, under the title of Congregationall Presbyters, was seated in one Church; This, if it were meant, as the words sound, were the granting to us all that we contend, and would hardly be reconciled with the third observation, that the Church in the City was governed by the common councell of Presbyters; For sure each of those Presbyters is not a common councell; But I rather believe they have not so soone disclaimed their *premisses*, and therefore that it is more reasonable to interpret their words by their principles, than their meaning by their words, and so that by congregationall Presbyters they meant so many Colleges of such Presbyters, seated each of them, i.e. each of those Colleges in one Church; And if that be their conclusion, I must acknowledge it to accord perfectly with their *premisses*, which being already answered, there remains no force in the conclusion.

53. And for the second part, that not any of them was seated in more than one, understanding it againe as the words sound, it is no way contrary to our pretensions, for we doe not thinke that the Angel of Ephesus was seated in Smyrna, or in any Church but that of Ephesus, and the territory thereof; and although as that was a Metropolis, other Cities were under it, and so other Bishops subordinate to the Bishop of Ephesus, yet was not any other City the Seat of that Metropolitan, but onely Ephesus, whereof he takes his denomination, as although Rochester be under the Metropolis of Canterbury, yet the Archbishop of Canterbury is not seated at Rochester, but

but some other *Bishop* affix to that *City* and *Diocese*. As for any other meaning of it, proportionable to that which we were faine to affixe to the former, I confesse my selfe ignorant what it can tend to, For it is as if they should say, not any *councell* of *Presbyters* was seated in more *Churches* than one. Which is as if they should say, no one body is in severall places. And I know no *Prelatist* that either directly or by consequence hath affirmed it is.

54. What remains in the last Paragraph of this Chapter, is onely to state the *Question* betwixt us, which is all the while no more but this, whether *Tertullian* and *Irenæus* that call *Polycarpe* and *Onesymus* *Bishop* of *Smyna* and *Ephesus*, meane *Bishops*, *ἐπισκοπῶν* in a peculiar sense, or in a generall phrase, as all *Presbyters* are called *Bishops*. And this I acknowledge to be the onely question between us, and if *Bishops* doe signifie *Bishops*, I cannot doubt but the cause is by them adjudged on our side; And why it should not, they have, to conclude, onely this offer of argument, that *Bishops* and *Presbyters* had all one name in the *Apostles* dayes, and long after in *Irenæus's* time.

55. I am truly weary of the length of this Chapter, and cannot but by consent have some compassion on the Reader, and therefore I shall bring the matter to this short issue. This reason of theirs is no reason, unlesse the word *Bishop*, both in the *Apostles* dayes and long after *Irenæus's* time, signified a *Presbyter* in our moderne notion; For if both *ἐπισκοπος* and *πρεσβυτερος* *Bishop* and *Elder* signified *Bishop* in our notion, this againe gives the cause to us from them. And upon these termes I am content to leave it, if ever they finde in *Irenæus*, that *Episcopus* signifies a *Presbyter* in our moderne notion; I will confesse them Conquerours, but this they have not offered here to doe, and I have some moderate assurance they never will.

And so much for that Chapter.

CHAP. II.

Of the equivallence of the words Bishop and Elder in the New Testament.

Section I.

Foure sorts of equivallence of these words proposed.

Num. 1.

THe next place where I find my selfe call'd forth, is about the midst of their *seventh Chapter*, toward the bottom of pag. 92. *Onely for the conclusion of this Discourse, &c.* For although in the former part of that *Chapter* they undertake to vindicate their chiefe proofes of *Scripture*, *Act. 20. 17, 28. Phil. 1. 1. 1 Tim. 3. 1 Pet. 5.* and to make replies to the *Answers* given to them, and although it is most certaine that in the *Dissertations* every of those places are answered, and shew'd to be fully reconcileable with our *pretensions* for *Pralacy*, yet they have not pleased to take any notice of what is there said, which if they had done, I might, without insolence, undertake to shew, that it had prevented all appearance of force in any of their *Replies*; And therefore being by this meanes perfectly freed from all obligation to view any *Paragraph* of that former part of the *Chapter*, and having already said somewhat to the chiefe of their places, *Act. 20.* and fore-seeing a fit opportunity for the rest, I shall for mine own, and the *Readers* ease, punctually expect and obey the summons, appeare when I am call'd before them, but no sooner, avert their *charge*, and not multiply debates above what is necessary.

2.

Thus then they begin, that *there is a Doctor, a high Pralatist, &c.* That in a late Booke of his hath undertaken to make out these two great Paradoxes, 1. That wheresoever the word *Bishop* is used in the *New Testament*, it is to be taken in a *pralaticall* sense. 2. That wheresoever the word *Presbyter* is used in the *New Testament*, it is to be understood, not of a mere *Presbyter*, but of a *Bishop* properly so called. And whereas we say that the *Scripture-Bishop* is nothing else but a *Presbyter*, and that there was no *Bishops* distinct from *Presbyters* in the *Apostles*

apostles dayes, this Author on the contrary saith, that the Scripture-Presbyter is a true Bishop, and that there were no single and meere Presbyters in the Apostles dayes. For our parts we do not thinke it necessary to take a particular survey of all that is said in justification of these Paradoxes, onely we desire it may be considered.

There is so much of the sense of some passages in the *Dissertations* set downe in these words, that I am forced to believe, that I am the Author here charged for these two Paradoxes. That they are so styled by those who are contrary minded, and who have assumed a power, which, if either of these propositions be true, they must be obliged to part with, I cannot thinke strange; And if I should style their assertions as perfectly Paradox (i.e. as contrary to all the ancients sense or Doctrine in this matter) when they say that the Scripture-Bishop is nothing elie but a Presbyter, &c. this were certainly an introduction fit to be confronted to theirs, as being equally argumentative. But because this verball eloquence hath little of efficacy in it, and will never be a meanes of evincing the truth of our pretensions, by affirming the contrary to be errors or Paradoxes, and because what is affixt to me, is not intirely my sense, though it recite it in some part, and approach neere to it, I shall here begin with a brieife relation of what is affirmed by the *Dissertations* in this matter, and then inquire what is here produced to invalidate it.

Dissert. 4.c.6. the method leading to the consideration of the word [Bishop] and [Elder] in the Scripture, the first thing taken notice of was the *ισοδυναμία* or equivalence of these words in the opinion of many. To which purpose Theodoret, Chrysostome, Oecumenius, and St Hierome are cited, as favourers of this opinion, but this with some difference of the one from the other. And for the distinct stating of the Question, foure senses were set downe, wherein it was possible that this equivalence of the words might be understood: 1. That both Bishop and Elder should signifie one and the same, viz. a Bishop in our moderne notion. 2. That both should signifie the same thing, viz. a Presbyter. 3. That both of

them should signifie promiscuously; sometimes a *Bishop*, sometimes a *Presbyter*, i. e. that the word ἐπίσκοπος should sometime signifie a *Bishop*, sometime a *Presbyter*, and in like manner πρεσβύτερος signifie sometime a *Bishop*, sometime a *Presbyter*. 4. That the word *Bishop* should alwayes signifie a *singular Bishop*, and the word *Elder* sometimes a *Bishop*, and sometimes a *Presbyter*.

5.

Of these *four* senses of the *equivalence* of these words, it was sure no error to conclude, that they were not all of them true, each being *exclusive* of the other three; and although some of the *antients* might be brought in favour to one, more than to the other, yet this was eminently observable, that those that favoured that *species*, which is most for the *Presbyterians* interest to be accepted, doe yet assert the cause of the *Prelatists* as confidently as any. So *Theodore*, who seemes most to assert the *second species*, doth yet propugne the *μικρὸν τιμὰ*, the *superiour dignity* of *Bishops* above *Presbyters*, and affirmes *

* τὰς νῦν κα-
λημῆναι ἐπι-
σκοπὸν Ἄπο-
στόλους ὡνόμη-
ζον, &c. *Theo.* saith he, *Titus* was *Apostle* of the *Cretanes*, and *Timothy* of the in *1 Tim.* 3. 1 *Asiaticks*.

6.

In *Phil.* 1.
and *Act.* 20.
and *1 Pet.* 5. 1.

So when *Chrysostome*, and *Theophylact*, and *Oecumenius* approve of the third *species*, and affirmes *Bishops* to be called *Presbyters* (and *Deacons* also) and on the contrary *Presbyters* to be called *Bishops*, yet of each of them it is notorious, that they asserted the *superiority* of *Bishops* over *Presbyters*, not onely in their owne, but in the *Apostles* time. And to that purpose the *concession* and *testimony* of *Peter. Moulin* was produced, that the most famous *Bishops* of the *antient Church*, *Chrysostome*, &c. did not thinke it any diminution to their dignity that the words *Bishop* and *Elder* were at first conceived to be used in the same sense, which observation being premised, and thereby the *Prelatists* pretensions competently secured, which soever of those senses should be accepted, so long as they that were authors of the assertions be permitted to give their owne interpretation of them; It was then,

Epist. 1. ad
Episc. Winon.

I thought, perfectly *seasonable* and safe to discusse the *question* freely, and to set downe what to me appeared most *probable*, without *prejudice* to any other *dissenter*, and upon those termes, and not otherwise, these two *propositions* were offered to farther consideration of *learned men*.

1. That the word 'Επίσκοπος in Scripture constantly signifie 7.
a singular Bishop.

2. That the word Πρεσβύτερος either constantly signifies a Bishop also, or else commonly a Bishop, and sometime, but rarely, a Presbyter.

These are somewhat different from the two *paradoxes* affixt to me, And in these termes I shall now resume them againe, and cleare them to be no *paradoxes*. And begin first with the former of them, concerning the word 'Επίσκοπος Bishop. And this is already done, 1. By considering the originall notation, and use in the *Old Testament*, of the word 'Επίσκοπος, then by going over every place in the *New Testament*, where the word Bishop is used. 8.

Section I I.

Of the word 'Επίσκοπος.

THe word 'Επίσκοπος naturally signifying an *overseer*, and used by *Aristides* for ἡγέμων the *Governour*, the same Num. 1. that *Iustinian* calls Ἀρχων ἐπαρχιῶν ἢ Μητροπόλεως, the *Ruler of Provinces and Metropoles*, and by *Cicero* ad *Atticum* rendered *speculator & custos*, one that looks to, and guards a Province (and so fitly styled *Angel*, who is generally deemed to have those two Offices, and is in the *Scripture* called an *eye*, and vulgarly a *guardian*) doth in the *Greece* of the *Old Testament* sometime render the *Hebrew* מַלְאָךְ, which is common to *God*, *Lord*, *Angel*, and generally denotes *Dominion*; sometimes מַמְלֵכָה a *Præfect* or *Commissary*, intrusted with the administration of some affaire, whether in *army*, as a *Commander*, Numb. 31. 14. in *Mechanicall* working, as a *Master-workman*, 2 Chron. 34. 12. 17. in a *City*, a *Ruler* or *Prince*, Nehem. 11. 9. peculiarly the *chiefe* of the *Priests* v. 10 in the *Ministry* of the *Temple* as *Eleazar* (the *Ruler* of the *Levites*)

vites) Num. 4. 16. and lastly in the *House of the Lord*, the *Ruler* set over that, 2 Kin. 11. 18. And the result of all this is, that it generally signifies an office of charge and dignity and power and superiority over others, all one with ἐπιστάτης, πρεσβύτερος, ἄρχων, κωμάρχης, τοπάρχης, which are all used to render the same word that Ἐπίσκοπος doth, and so is most fitly qualified to signify the like, viz. a *praefecture* in the *Christian Church* under the *New Testament*.

2. Accordingly there we finde it applied, 1. to *Christ* himselfe, the *Bishop of our soules*, who though he ministred to his *Disciples*, yet owned the title of *Lord* and *Master*; as that which from them belonged to him, *Joh. 13. 13*. Secondly, to the *Apostles* *Act. 1. 20*. And for all other places where it is used, it is evidently capable of a sense very agreeable to these premisses, being never once used in the *New Testament*, but where it will be very commodious to render it *Bishop* in our moderne notion of the word for a *singular praefect* in each *Church*, not a *colleague* in a *Presbytery*.

3. This is at large shew'd by a survey of every of those places; First, that of *Act. 20. 28*. where the *Apostle* takes leave, and exhorts the *Bishops* set over the *flock* by the *Holy Ghost*: They are there bid to feed the *Church of God*, i.e. the *Christians* of the severall *Cities of Asia*, or neer about *Ephesus*, as was in the last Chapter evidenced out of *Irenaeus*, auditor to *Polycarpe* made *Bishop of Smyrna* by *St. John*, and therefore may well be resolved to be the *singular Bishops* of those *Cities*, and not onely of the one *City of Ephesus*, as was largely shewed in the last Chapter.

4. The second place is that of *1 hil. 1. 1*. where after the mention of all the *Saints in Christ Jesus* which are at *Philippi*, is added, with the *Bishops* and *Deacons*; where although some of the *Greeke Commentators*, which at the same time assert *Episcopacy*, do for that very reason, because there could not be

* εἴπε τὰς πρεσβυτέρας, many *Bishops* in o e *City*, understand that place of *Presbyters* in our moderne notion, and adde that the words * *Bishop* and ἡ γὰρ δε ἐν μία πόλει πολλοὶ ἦσαν ἐπίσκοποι, ὅπου γὰρ ἦσαν διακονεῖν τὰ ὀνόματα, *Theophyl.* in *Phil. 1. 1*.

Pres-

Presbyter, yea and *Deacon* too, were not as yet distinct, but promiscuously used, the one for the other; here the word *Bishops* for *Presbyters*, as elsewhere the *Presbytery* is used for *Bishops*, 1 *Tim.* 4. 4. adding this reason *, because *Presbyters* ordained not a *Bishop*: And although many expedients were ready at hand to keepe the *Text* from being usefull to the *Presbyterians*, in case it were granted that by *Bishops* the *Presbyters* were meant, as that *Epaphroditus* their present *Bishop* (as is acknowledged by *Theodoret*, *Chrysostome* and *Theophylact*, who are most favourable to that interpretation) was with *St. Paul* at the writing that *Epistle*, c. 4. 18. yet I have the authority of *Epiphanius* to affirme, that ἐπίσκοποι; there signifies peculiarly *Bishops*, and I doubt not but it may doe so, referring it to all the *Bishops* of the severall Cities belonging to that *Metropolis*.

* γὰρ πρεσ-
βύτεροι τὸν
ἐπίσκοπον
ἐχειροτόνουν.

For such was *Philippi*, both as the first-fruits of all *Macedonia*, first converted to the Faith, *Act.* 16. 9 & πρώτη τῆς μετέδ Μακεδονίας πόλις, a prime City of that Province of *Macedon*, v. 12. of it selfe, before it's conversion, and so faith * *Photius* distinctly, Ἡ φιλιππων πόλις τῆς Μακεδόνων ἐπαρχίας μητροπολις ἔσται, and accordingly *Polycarpus Epistle* to them is inscribed τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ παροικήσῃ φιλιπποῖς to the whole province that belongs to *Philippi*; In which there being diverse Cities, and *Bishops* in them, the *Epistle* to *St. Paul* is to be conceived written to them all, (as the *Epistle* to the *Corinthians* appeares to have been written to the Saints of all *Achaia*) and being inscribed to *Philippi*, was to be communicated to those others, as the *Epistle* to the *Colossians* was to be communicated to the *Laodiceans*, *Col.* 4. 16. and that which the *Laodiceans* had received (whether, as *Tertullian* seemes to believe, that to the *Ephesians*, or any other) in like manner to be communicated to the *Colossians*, and the *Epistle* of the Church of *Jerusalem* to the Church of *Antioch* did belong and was communicated to all the Churches of *Syria* and *Cilicia*, *Act.* 16. 4.

5.

* *Epist.* 247.

And then all that the immediate subjoyning of the *Deacons* in that place, will conclude, is onely this (which is farre from yeilding the *Presbyterians* any profit) that as

6.

○

* *Epi-*

* πλήθους μὴ * *Epiphanius* saith, νέαι ὄντες ἐκκλησίαι, the *Churches* being
 ὄντες ἐκ ἐν- but newly planted, there were not *Presbyters* as yet constituted
 ῥέθησαν ἐν among them, onely a *Bishop* with one *Deacon* or more in each
 αὐτοῖς πρεσ- City, in like manner as it was at *Jerusalem* *Act. 6.* where
 βύτοι κα- after *James's* assumption to the *Bishoprick*, which the *Eccle-*
 λασθῆναι, siasticall writers tell us of, the *seven Deacons* are soone insti-
 καὶ ἡρεκρίθησαν tuted, no *Presbyters* being created in the middle, betwixt the
 ὅτι τῷ κατὰ *Bishop* and them, that either *Scripture* or ancient *Record* in-
 τόπον μόνον forme us of.
 ἐπισκόπων,
 ἀνεν δε διακόνου ἐπισκοπὸν ἀδελφόν εἶναι. l. 1. *Contr. Aër.*

7. And † *Clemens*, *St. Pauls fellow Labourer*, mentions it as
 † *Clem. Rom.* the generall practice, that the *Apostles* preaching through
Ep. ad Corinth. *Regions* and *Cities* constituted their first fruits into *Bishops* and
Deacons of those which should come in to the faith.

8. Thus farre is this from being a forced interpretation being
 perfectly regular, and conformable to what we read of those
 times, out of the best and antientest *Records* of them; And
 if in any circumstance we should be lyable to mistake, yet for
 the maine, the *Reader* will hardly thinke it possible, when
 he remembers this very *Church* of the *Philippians* to be one
 of those expressly named by *Tertullian*, among whom in
 his time, *Apostolorum Cathedra suis adhuc locis præsidebantur*,
The Chaires of the Apostles were yet extant presiding in their
due places, which concludes some *Bishop* or singular *presett*
 to have succeeded the *Apostles* in this *Church* (as in those
 other, *Thessalonica*, &c.) and by *Theodoret*, whose authority is
 most used against us in this matter, to prove that the *Bishops*
 were *Presbyters* here, *Epaphroditus* is expressly affirmed to be
 that *Bishop*.

9. The next place is that of 1 *Tim. 3. 1, 2.* If any man desire
 the Office of a *Bishop* he coveteth a good worke: A *Bishop* there-
 fore must be blamelesse—where there is no reason of doubt-
 ing, but the *Bishop* is the singular *presett* or *Governour* of the
Church; For the onely appearance of the contrary being
 againe (as in that to the *Philippians*) the immediate subjoy-
 ning of *Deacons* and their qualifications, v. 8. that presently
 vanisheth,

vanisheth, if againe we remember the observation of *Epiphanius*, which he had out of the most *ancient Records*, and was found exactly conformable to the expresse words of *Clemens Romanus*, the contemporary of the *Apostles*, that at the beginning of the Church τὰ πληρώματα τῆς οἰκουμῆς ὑπολαβόντες, before the government was compleate in all the Offices, the *Apostles* and *Apostolicall* persons placed in the Church by them, such as *Timothy* to whom here he gives the directions, created no more but a *Bishop* and *Deacon* (one or more) in each Church, the present state of things neither requiring nor being well capable of any more, in respect of the paucity of the Christians to be governed or instructed, and of those which were fit to be made *Presbyters*.

And although *Theodore*t againe (with some few others) interpret the place of *Presbyters*, yet 'tis as evident, he doth it not to the disadvantage of *Bishops*, adding in the same place, that the *Bishops* especially should observe these Lawes ἀπὸ δὲ καὶ μείζωνος μέλας χάριτας τιμῆς, as those which had attained to a greater honour.

10.

Meanewhile *S. Chrysostome* interprets it distinctly of *Bishops*, as I have done, and in that notion of *Bishops* which sever* them from *Presbyters*, such as governe in each City, and addeth the qualifications to be such, as being spoken of *Bishops*, καὶ πρεσβυτέροις ἀρόμενοι, doe agree to *Presbyters* also. And accordingly *Theophylact* interprets it of the πρῶτος and ἀρχων, the *President* and *Ruler*, without any mention of *Presbyters*.

11.

* Ἐπισκόπων ἔδει πολλῶν ἑκάστῳ πόλιν πρῶτον πρεσβυτέρων.

There remains but one place, and that of the very same nature with this last, and must certainly be regulated by it, *Tir. 1. 7. For a Bishop must be blamelesse, as the steward of God* (answerable to that notion of the word *Bishop* in the *Old Testament* for the *Ruler* set over the *House of the Lord*, 2 *Kin. 11. 18. i.e. the Steward*, to whom the *Keyes of the House* were committed, *Isa. 22. 22.*) That this is the singular *Bishop* in every City, signified before v. 5. by the *Elders*, which *Titus* was left in *Crete* to constitute, is the joynt affirmation of *St. Chrysostome*, *Theophylact* and *Oecumenius* on those words of v. 5. *Elders in every City*, Ἐπισκόπος ὡς ἐν ἑκάστη πόλει,

12.

* L. 3. c. 4.
 † Arg. Ep.
 ad Tit. In tit.
 1. Rom. 1.
 * τοῦτων
 ἐπισκόπων
 κείνῳ καὶ
 χειροτονίας,
 Arg. Ep.

13.

ὡς καὶ ἐν τῇ πρὸς Τιμόθεον, &c. By Elders he there means Bishops, as in the Epistle to Timothy, appointing them to be constituted in every city, for he would not have the whole Island administered by one, but that every City should have it's proper Pastor (or Bishop) that so the labour might be the lighter, and the care more exact. In Crete there were certainly many Cities, Eusebius mentions an hundred, of all which, * saith he, Titus was made Bishop by St. Paul, that under him, saith † Theodoret, he might ordain Bishops: to which * Chrysostome and Theophylact adde τῷ κείνῳ ἐπισκόπων, that he might have power to judge or censure those Bishops, as a Metropolitan and Primate over them.

There is now no other place wherein the word Bishop is used, and by this brief view of these, I hope the first proposition is competently rescued from meriting the censure of Paradox, whether that signifie novell or strange; this being so conformable both to the nature and use of the word, to the tradition of the antient Church, and the importance of each Scripture, where it is used, that Bishop should signifie ἰδιὸς ποιμήν, the singular Pastor or Governour in each City or Church.

Section III.

Of the word Πρεσβύτερος Elder.

Num. 1.

NOW to the second proposition, which pretended not to so much positiveness, but is set down in a greater latitude of defining, that the word πρεσβύτερος either constantly signifies a Bishop also, or else commonly a Bishop, though sometimes, but most rarely a Presbyter. Of this I shall now need to premise but these few things.

2.

First, that the nature of the word ἱπρ commonly rendred πρεσβύτερος Elder in the Old Testament, doth denote most properly, and signifie most constantly (as in all Languages the word is found vulgarly to doe) a Ruler or Governour. This is so largely deduced and demonstrated in the Annotation

no.

on *Act.* 11.30. that I shall not indeavour farther to manifest it.

Secondly, that as in some places of the *New Testament* the word is necessarily to be understood of *Bishops*, so in every other place it is very fitly capable of that *interpretation*; This is againe so particularly evidenced to the *Latine Reader*, *Diss.* 4.c. 19, 20, 21, 22. and to the *English Reader* *Annot.* on *Act.* 11. b. and 14. a. that I cannot deeme it reasonable to tire my selfe farther with transcribing it.

Thirdly, that if any one or more places shall be thought by any man to belong to *Presbyters* in our moderne sense, as that of *1am* 5. 14. or the like, I shall onely desire, that he will bring any convincing prooffe or *authentick Testimony*, that in that or those places it so signifies, and I shall most willingly grant it to him, and be so farre from thinking it, in the least degree, disadvantageous to our pretensions, that I shall not doubt to evidence it a *demonstrative* argument to confirm them, but shall not need to insist on that, till such prooffe be offered.

Fourthly, that by this it is already most evident, that my *assertion* was not truly cited p. 92. in these words, that *where-soever the word Presbyter is used in the New Testament, it is to be understood not of a meere Presbyter, but of a Bishop properly so called*; Certainly neither my words nor sense extended to the *where-soever*—and, *it is to be*—being onely in a *disjunctive* forme, *either constantly so, or sometimes but rarely otherwise*.

Fifthly, that if I were not misreported, and the *Paradox* were as high and as *positive*, as it is represented, yet I conceive not the reason why they that have with great confidence affirmed that both *Bishops* and *Elders* do alway signifie in *Scripture* their *Presbyters* and no more, (for if either of those words do but once signifie a *Bishop*, their *Ius Divinum*, and whole cause falls to the ground irrecoverably) should be so much at leisure from *excusing* themselves, to *accuse* that for a *Paradox* in others, which is not imaginable to be more an *extreme* on one side, then theirs is on the other.

7. Lastly, that if they *doe not think it necessary to take a particular survey of all that is said in justification of these* (which they thus please to style) *Paradoxes*, which is in effect, as if they should professe to *deny and declaime against the conclusion*, without attempting to *satisfie any reason*, by which it is *inferr'd*; It might be as just in me to tender them *answers of the same making*, and so to supersede any farther dispute in this matter.
8. But I shall not *imitate* their method, but rather prepare to attend them in it, and having thus farre served them, by undertaking the *taske which was due to them*, in giving the *Reader a brieve view of the grounds of my Assertions*, which were *too long* for them to take notice of, I shall now trace their steps, and follow them which way soever they lead.

Section I V.

Of Reverence to Antiquity, and the Interpretations of the Antients. Of Pralatists disagreement among themselves.

- Num. 1. **F**irst then, say they, *we desire it may be considered, that these assertions are contrary to antiquity, which yet notwithstanding our Brethren doe so highly magnifie and boast of it in this controversy, and for receding from which, as they say we do, they doe most deeply charge us.*
2. That these *Assertions*, as farre as they are owned by me, and are *Assertions*, are so distant from being *contrary to antiquity*, that they are founded in the *Records of the most antient reverend authority*, hath appeared most plainly by what hath now been said, and had before been laid, as the *ground of the interpretations*, in the fourth *Dissert.* if they, which gathered the *conclusion* from thence, would have vouchsafed to take notice of the *promisses*.
3. The utmost that can be with truth pretended, is, that some of the *Texts*, which we have insisted on here, and so likewise some of those where *πρεσβυτεροι Elders* are mentioned, are
not

not by all the *antients* interpreted just in that manner, as I thinke they may safely and most probably be *interpreted*, and so as they will best accord with the opinions which those very *antients* appeared to have concerning the *Originall* of *Epi-scopacy*.

In this I hope I have not *offended* against the *antient Church*, or if I had, as I should have expected other *accu-sers*, than those I have, so should I waite for no other *judge* but my selfe, and immediately submit to any *penance* for it.

But they which truly *reverence antiquity*, discern also wherein this *Reverence* is terminated, not in *adhering* to every *interpretation* of each *Text* of *Scripture* given by any *antient Commentator* or *Interpreter*, for truly that is *absolutely impossible*, severall of them being known in *interpreting* of *Texts* very frequently to differ one from the other; This can be no newes to any man, who hath but lightly view-ed them, or but *occasionally* consulted *Tirinus*, or such like later *Commentators*, who have collected the *Interpretations* of the *Antients*, and *marshalled* their names, and told us how many have been for one, how many for another sense of such a *Text*.

And in affaires of this nature, wherein they have neither taught *Doctrines*, nor testified *Traditions*, but onely exprest their single *opinions*, or *conjectures* of an *Apostles* meaning in words capable of more senses than one, I know no *Prola-rist* that ever denied later *Writers liberty* to recede from one, and adhere to some other of the *antients*, or if more con-vincing reasons appeared for any *fresh* interpretation, never given before, the like liberty hath been *allowed*; And indeed if it were not so, our *studying* of the *Originalls*, inquiry into the nature of words and *phrases*, observation of *customs* a-mong the *antients*, and all wherein *learned* men differ from *unlearned*, consideration of the *context* and *argument*, τὸ λογικόν as well as τὸ ψυχικόν of each *difficult* place, and all the other skills and advantages of a good *Interpreter* would all be *unusefull* first, and then *dangerous*, would tempt one off to recede from some *former Writers*, to forsake the *road* and *method*.

4.

5.

6.

method (so ordinary) of *transcribing* other mens labours , and by inciting him to say any thing which had not oft been said before, (which if it have, why doth he againe trouble himself and others to *repeat* it) would infallibly involve him under the *burthen* and *guilt* that is here laid on me, of being *contrary* to *Antiquity*.

7. But I am unwilling to discourage them from any sort or degree of *reverence* to *antiquity*, and on condition they will be fairely tried by it in any notion by which they can imagine to define that *Reverence*, or the word *Antiquity*, I will forgoe all my novell *interpretations*, and say no one word which the *Antients* have not distinctly said before me, and refer the whole fate of the cause to this *judicature*.

8. Their *second consideration* is, that they are *contrary* to all that have ever written in defence of *Episcopacy*, from whence they conclude that till their brethren (i.e. we *Prælatists*) agree among themselves, they need not spend time to answer the private *Opinions* of one *Doctor*.

9. To this I answer, that it hath alwayes been deemed lawfull to any man, which hath undertaken the defence of a *Christian cause*, asserted constantly by the *Church*, to choose his *arguments* (as *combatants* do their *weapons*) such as he thinkes are fittest for his *manager*, and will most probably (in his opinion) convince the *gainsayers*; No obligation lying upon him by the *Lawes* of these *agones*, to use those *arguments* (and no other, nor otherwise improved) which all other writers of that side have done before him; For if this were the manner of the *νομιμὸς ἀδελφότητος* the *legall combat*, to what end should any *second* writing on the same subject ever appeare to the World? That which had been formerly said, needed not to be transcribed and said againe, but either the booke might be *Re-printed* or translated into a language more intelligible (as I have here been faine oft to doe) And though I might truly say, that for those more minute *considerations* or *conjectures*, wherein this *Doctor* differs from some others, who have written before him (as to the manner of interpreting some few *Texts*) he hath the *suffrages* of many the *learnedst* men of this *Church* at this day (and as farre

as he knowes, of all that imbrace the same cause with him) yet I doe not thinke it necessary to prove my agreement with others of my brethren by this onely medium; It being certaine that they who believe the same conclusion upon severall mediums or wayes of inferring it, are in that, and may be in all other conclusions at perfect accord and unity among themselves.

All that I can conclude from this and the former consideration (the double charge laid on me of contrariety to antiquity, and other asserters of Episcopacy) is onely this, that the authors of them are ill pleased, that I use any other arguments, or answers but what they were willing to assigne me: otherwise if there had been lesse, not more truth, or evidence in my way of defending the cause, they would have had the greater advantage against me, and I doubt not, have been, in the space of three yeares, at leisure to have observed it.

10.

Section V.

Inconveniencies objected, and answer'd. Of more Bishops in one City, No Presbyters in the Apostles dayes. The no Divine right of the Order of Presbyters.

But they are, in the third place, pleased to object some inconveniencies which the defending of these paradoxes must necessarily bring upon me; And to these I shall more diligently attend.

Num. 1.

First, say they, he that will defend these Paradoxes must of necessity be forced to grant that there were more Bishops than one in a City in the Apostles dayes, which is to betray the cause of Episcopacy, and to bring downe a Bishop to the ranke of a Presbyter.

2.

To this I reply by absolute denying of this consequence (for supposing the Scripture-Bishop to be alwayes a Bishop, and so the Scripture Elder also, how can it follow from thence that there are more such Bishops in any one City?) 'Tis most evident that this is no way inferr'd upon either, or both of

3.

my assertions, nor is here one word added to prove it is, to which I might accommodate any answer. Tis on the contrary most manifest, that whensoever I find mention of *Bishops* or *Elders* in the *plural*, as *Act. 20. Phil. 1. &c.* I interpret them of the *Bishops* of *Asia*, and the *Bishops* of *Macedonia*, *Bishops* of *Judea*, &c. (and render my reasons of doing so) and consequently affirme them to be the *Bishops* of divers (sure that is not of one) *Cities*.

4. The second inconvenience is, that I must be forced to grant that there were no *Bishops* over *Presbyters* in the *Apostles* days, for if there were no *Presbyters*, there could be no *Bishops* over *Presbyters*.

5. Here is an evident mistake, for I no where say, that there were no *Presbyters* in the *Apostles* dayes, but onely that in the *Apostles* writings the word [*Bishops*] alwayes signifies *Bishops*, and the word [*Elders*] either never, or but rarely, *Presbyters*; Now besides that it is possible for those to be in the time of the *Apostles* writing, which yet for want of occasion are not mentioned in those writings (and I that love not negative arguments à *testimonio*, should never have thought fit to conclude there were no *Presbyters* within the time wherein the severall Bookes of Scripture were written, upon that one argument; because I could not find them mentioned there) besides this, I say, Tis certaine that the *Apostles* times are somewhat a larger period than the time of the *Apostles* writings, and therefore that what is spoken onely of the later, was not meant to be extended to the former.

6. For 1. the *Apostles* continued alive some time after writing their *Epistles*, and secondly, some of the *Apostles* survived other; *John*, of whom *Christ* will was intimated, that he should tarry, and not die till after the coming of *Christ*, and that Kingdom of his, commenced in the destruction of the *Jews*, did accordingly live till *Trajan*'s time, and by that time I thinke it probable that the number of *believers* daily increasing, there were, as the wants of the Church required, *Presbyters* ordained in many Churches: And accordingly in the *Dissert. p. 229.* when I speak of this matter, I expressly except

except S. *John*, and p. 211. I make use of a testimony of *Clement Alexandrinus*, on purpose to conclude that this *Apostle* ordein'd *Presbyters* in *Asia*, after his returne from the *Island*, to which he was banished, *ἐπεὶ μὲν ἐπισκόπος καλεῖσθαι, ἐπεὶ ὅλας ἐκκλησίας ἀρμόσων*, &c. and to the same matter I * else- * *Dissert* 4. c. 4. Sect. 4, 5. where apply that of *Ephiphanius*, out of the profoundest, i.e. ancientest Records, that as *Moses* and *Aaron* tooke to them first the *Princes* of the people, and at length the *Sanhedrim* of the *seventy Elders*, so the *Apostles* first constituted *Bishops*, and in proesse of time *Presbyters* also, when occasion required, as the *Bishops assistants*, and *Councell*, and that upon account of this *Analogy* with the *Sanhedrim*, they were styled *πρεσβύτεροι Elders*.

And *Ignatius* making mention of *Presbyters*, as of a middle degree in the Church betwixt *Bishops* and *Deacons* in his, i.e. in *Trajan's* time, and that in his *Epistles* to severall of those *Asian Churches*, *Smyrna*, *Ephesus*, *Magnesia*, *Philadelphia*, *Trallis*, I thinke the argument of great validity to conclude, that in that *Province* that *Apostle* had in his life time instituted this middle order. And therefore I that had so carefully prevented, was not to be charged with this crime of affirming there were no *Presbyters*, or *Bishops* over *Presbyters* (which certainly there were, if there were *Presbyters* under them) in the *Apostles* dayes.

7.

And third inconvenience they adde, that by consequence I must affirme that *Ordo Presbyteratus* is not *Jure Divino*.

8.

But that is no more consequent to my assertion, than it was my assertion, that there were no *Presbyters* in the *Apostles* dayes, and therefore I that am guiltlesse of the assertion, cannot be charged with the consequents of it; *John* I know was an *Apostle*, and *John*, I believe, ordained *Presbyters*, and thence I doubt not to conclude the *Apostolicall institution*, i.e. in effect, the *Divine right* of the order of *Presbyters*, though not of the government of the Church by *Presbytery*; and so I am still cleare from the guilt of that crime which the worst of *Papists* would abhorminate, which they are resolved I must have layen under, if I had questioned the *Divine Right* of *Presbyters*, though they can more than question the *Divine*

9.

13. *Right of Bishops*, and never have remorse or compunction, or dread any charge or sentence for it.

SECT. VI.

A first confession objected and vindicated. Of the Ephesine Presbyters being all the Prælates of Asia, Elders, Aldermanni.

Nam. r.

After these inconveniences briefly touched (and almost as briefly by me averted) they proceede to take notice in the fourth place, of some confessions of mine, which the justification of my opinion have forced from me. By this method thinking (as at length they say) to render *Episcopacy*, that is thus maintained, or else my way of maintaining it, odious and contemptible to all sober, and godly, and moderate Christians, i.e. to all those, who for the attaining of those titles, good opinion, and good words from them, shall be invited to contemne, or hate those, whom they are yet pleased to call their brethren. And this I confesse is the most compendious way of confusing that which would not otherwise be confused.

2. What those confessions of mine are, which are like to render my assertions so odious, I must next take a view, and consider with what justice this is said by them.

3. The first is, that the Ephesine Presbyters, whom Paul sent for to Miletus, were all the Prælates of Asia.

4. To say that the Ephesine Presbyters, in their sense of the phrase, are Prælates of Asia, were, I confesse, a ridiculous, and so, if they please, a contemptible confession, but I have yet been under no such torture from their arguments, as should constrain such confession from mee. What I say is sufficiently known to be my free opinion, (and no forced confession, such as the necessity of a desperate enterprise might extort from me) that the Πρεσβύτεροι τῆς Ἀσιας, Elders of the Church, who by summons sent to Ephesus, the chiefe Metropolis of all Asia (and by that convenient way communicated to other Cities) were assembled to Paul at Miletus, Act. 20. 17. were, as Irenæus assures mee, the Bishops of the other Cities.

Cities in those parts, and not only of the one City of *Ephesus*.

What harshness there can be in this assertion, to be rejected as odious at the first hearing, I confesse I divine not, That those Cities had *Bishops*, as well as *Ephesus*, cannot be strange, or that *Paul* desired to speake with them before his finall parting. And that the *Bishops* may be called *Elders*, will be as little strange, if it be but remembred, what is at large shewed in the *Dissertation*, that the word *Elder* had in the *Old Testament*, denoted dignity and *Præfecture* in single persons, as when *Eleazer Abraham's Oeconomus*, who was set over his servants, is styled πρεσβύτερος τῆς οἰκίας αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἀρχὸν πάντων τῶν αὐτοῦ, the Elder of his house, and Ruler of all that was his (by Elder and Ruler signifying the same thing) and so the *Elders* πρεσβύτεροι, of the *Moabites*, Num. 22. 7. are the *Princes of Moab*, v. 8. and the *Elders* of *Israel* are the heads, or *Præfects* of the principall Families of *Israel*, Exod. 6. 14. the *Rulers of the people* c. 16. 22. the *Elders* of the *Tribes*, Deut. 31. 28. and all this, and much more, before they were called into a *Councill*, or *Senate*, to assist *Moses*, as appeares *Num.* 11. 16.

And proportionable to this hath been the use of the word among all Nations, ὁ πρεσβύτερος δὲ τῶν ὑπερομένων ἔχει, καὶ τὸ πᾶντες πείθονται, the Elder alwayes hath the Rule, and all obey him, saith * *Diodorus Siculus*, and so *Seniors*] in all languages is a title of honour and dignity.

And peculiarly among us, as when *Ethelstane* the halfe King (as he was called) of the *East Angles*, was saluted by the title of * *Aldermannus*, i.e. πρεσβύτερος, Elder of all *England*, and so *Ethelwod* and *Alwin*, so in King *Elfred's* *Lawes* c. 34. there is mention *Regis Aldermanni* and *Præbyteri Regis*; And accordingly *Mat.* 20. 25. those words of the *Princes of the Nations* exercising dominion over them, are by the *Saxons* interpreted *Ealdormen* pealdorþ hira deoda, *Elders have dominion over their Nation*, and *Luke* 9. 22. the *Elders* and chief of the *Priests* are by them rendred *Ealdorþen* and *Ealdorþmannum*. All taking the word *Elder* for a title of *Dignity* and *præfecture* (and from that notion of it the *Presbyterians* are not observed to decline.)

And then finally that the addition of τῆς ἐκκλησίας the Church,

5.

6.

* L. 2.

7.

* *Ed. Autho.*
lit. Rames. Sect.
4. and 37. and
S. Hen. Spelman's
Glossary. p. 28.
29.

8.

Church, though in the singular, cannot make it unfit for these Elders to denote the Bish. ps of Asia, or neere Ephesus under that Metropolis, hath been already accounted for at large. And so still I hope they, and all godly and moderate brethren need neither hate, nor contemne Episcopacy, nor the defenders of it, upon pretense of this (so farre from incommodious or inconvenient) confession.

Section VII.

A second confession of the Bishops, Phil. 1. 1. being Bishops of that whole Province, Philippi a Metropolis, and a Colony.

Num. 1.

Like unto this first, is the second which they take notice of, *That the Bishops of Philippi, whom S. Paul salutes Ch. 1. were not the Bishops of that City onely, but of the whole Province, whereas Theophylact saith that Philippi was μικρὴ πόλις ὑπὸ μητροπόλεως Θεσσαλονίκης τελευτᾶ, a little City subject to the Metropolis of Thessalonica.*

2. That the word Ἐπίσκοποι *Bishops*, Phil. 1. 1. denotes the *Bishops* of the Cities of *Macedonia*, which were under this πρώτη πόλις, chiefe City, or *Metropolis*, as S. Luke calls it, Acts 16. 12. is already evidenced to be no strange or violent (I hope as little odious) *confession*. I neede not farther repeat, or enlarge on that, but beare in good part, whatsoever fate is decreed by them to attend that *Confession*.

3. As for the *Objection* which is here subjoyned, and to which they were directed by *Dissert. 4. c. 10. Sect. 12.* they might, if they had been so pleased, have taken the *antidote* with the *poyson*, observed, and tendred to the Reader the *answer*, which in the five following Sections is solemnly rendred to it, and confuted that *answer*, if they had discerned any *infirmie* part in it.

4. First then, the *answer* is, that that *description* of *Philippi* in the *argument* prefixt to *Theophylact's* notes on that *Epistle*, was taken out of an *antient Geographer*, and belonged to that
City

City, as it was built by Philip, having been formerly called *Kelwidēs*, then *Δελφ*: not to the later times, under the *Roman Empire*, and that it is no new, or strange thing, that under the Romans those Cities should become *Metropoles*, which formerly had not been such, to which agrees that of the *Conncell of Chalcedon, Can. 12.* which mentions, *πόλεις δια γραμμάτων βασιλικῶν τῇ τῆς μετροπόλεως ὀνόματι τιμηθείσας*. Cities honoured by the imperiall Letters with the name and dignity of *Metropoles*.

And indeed the saying of * *Strabo* is of evident truth, ordinarily experimented, that *Provinces* were often confounded 5.
* Geogr. l. 13.
δια τὸ τῶν Ρωμαίων μὴ κατὰ φύλα διελθεῖν αὐτὰς, ἀλλ' ἕτερον τρόπον διαλάττει διουήσεις, ἐν αἷς ἀγορεύει ποιεῖναι, by cause of the Romans distributing them not according to the distributions of Regions or Nations (such as the *Geographers* antiently had made use of) but after another manner, according to the Cities, in which they kept their Courts or *Assises*, as before was said of the Cities of *Asia*.

Accordingly when *S. Paul* first comes to *Philippi*, *St. Luke* mentions it under the title of the prime City of the Province of *Macedonia*, and is not that more to be heeded, speaking so expressly of that City at that time, then that *Geographers* description, which no way discovers to what time it belongs, and cannot belong to this time of the planting the faith at *Philippi*, if *S. Luke* may be believed? 6.

Secondly, the same *St. Luke* saith of it at that time, that it was *κολωνία* a colony of, i.e. a City replenished by the Inhabitation of the *Romanes*; And of those Colonies in chiefe Cities, there is no question but they were especially chosen to be places of their *Assises*, whither the Neighbouring Cities resorted for Justice, and so were *Metropoles* in the civill accounts. 7.

Thirdly, of this City of *Philippi* 'tis as evident, that it was the first converted of all *Macedonia*, and that from thence he went after to *Thessalonica*; And so the right of *Primogeniture*, which ordinarily gave claime to the *Metropolitick* dignity in the Ecclesiasticall account (as in the case of *Antioch* and *Jerusalem* appears) belonging to *Philippi*, over and above 8.

above the forementioned precedence thereof in *civill account*, there is no reason to doubt, but this was a *Metropolitick Church*, an *Elder Sister* to *Thessalonica*, and each a *Mother* to the *Churches* of lesser Cities of *Macedonia* that belonged to them.

9. According to which it is, that *Polycarpe* in his *Epistle*, mentions *St. Pauls* Epistles in the *plurall*, written to these *Philippians*, which learned men interpret of the Epistles to the *Thessalonians*, and it cannot commodiously be understood any other way.

SECT VIII.

A third Confession, of Timothies being an Archbishop. Of the qualifications, 1 Tim. 3. 2. belonging to Bishops. Of the Bishops being worthy of double honour, though he never preach. Of the word, and Doctrine. Of the Presbytery, 1 Tim. 4. Of Rebuking and receiving accusation against an Elder.

Num. 1.

THE third Confession is, that *Timothy* was *Archbishop* of *Ephesus*, that when *Paul* sets downe the qualifications of *Bishops*, though he mention none but such as are common to a *Presbyter* with a *Bishop*, yet he is to be understood to speake of *Bishops* in a *Prælativall* sense, and not at all of *Presbyters*; And when he saith the *Elders* that *Rule* well are worthy of double honour—, this is, saith this *Author*, the *Bishops* that *Rule* well— thereby holding out this great error, that a *Bishop* that *Ruleth* well is worthy of double honour, though he never preacheth; And when *St. Paul* bids *Timothy* not neglect the gift that was given him by the laying on the hands of the *Presbytery*, that is, saith he, of *Episcopacy*; And when the *Apostle* chargeth him not to rebuke an *Elder*,—and not to receive an accusation against an *Elder*,—this is to be understood of *Bishops*, saith he, and not of meere *Presbyters*.

2. To this accumulative crime affirmed to be confessed by me in so many particulars, I answer by avowing my Confession thus farre, 1. that I take *Timothy* to have been *Bishop* of

of *Ephesus*, and conclude it from 1 *Tim.* 1. 3. then that *Ephesus* was a *prime Metropolis* of *Asia*, from the testimonies of *Pliny* and *Ulpian*, and generally the *Antient Church-writers*: And from those two put together, I hope I may gaine liberty to confesse, that *Timothy* was *Archbishop* of *Ephesus*.

Secondly, That *Paul* 1 *Tim.* 3. 1, 2. speaking of *Episcopacy*, as of a good worke or office, and the *qualifications* required in the person to be promoted to it speakes of a *Bishop* in the *Prælati*cal sense; so I am sure *Chrysostome* doth understand him, and the testimony was lately cited out of him, and *Theodore*t that understands it otherwise, yet applies it first to *Bishops*, and saith on that occasion, that their degree in the *Church* is superior to that of *Presbyters*. And if no higher qualifications be required of a *Bishop*, than are fit to be required of a *Presbyter* (which yet I no where say, and the argument taken from the no-other qualifications here specified, than onely for the *Bishop* and the *Deacon*, are of no force to induce it, both because it is a negative argument, and there is another reason for the omitting *Presbyters*, because in this *insancie* of the *Church* there was not any such need of them, the *Bishop* with his *Deacon*, one or more, were sufficient in every *City*, and besides the qualifications assigned the *Deacon*, may be common to him with the *Presbyter*, as well as those assign'd the *Bishop*) yet that is no prejudice to the superiority of the office, or to my interpreting that *Text* of the *Bishop*; For sure I may as conveniently say, that the *Bishop* is named without the *Presbyter*, at a time when there were *Bishops*, but as yet no *Presbyters* in the *Church*, and that when there were *Presbyters* instituted, their qualifications were to be regulated by the rules given of *Bishops*, as it can be imagined to be fitly said by them, that the place is meant of *Presbyters* (when the *Aposle* names *Bishops* expressly, and when by many other evidences we know, that then there were *Bishops*, but by no footsteps can discern that then there were *Presbyters*) upon no other reason, but that the qualifications are common to *Presbyters*.

Thirdly, For the mention of the *Elders* that rule well, 1 *Tim.* 5. 17. I doubt not but it may, very commodiously be interpreted

3.

4.

puted of the *Bishops* through all his *Province*, for as there the style is *πρεσβύτες*, *præside* or *rule*, so 'tis certaine, that in the use of the *Church* this was the title of the *Bishops*, as hath formerly been shewed out of *Iustin Martyr* and others, and the *διπλὴ τιμὴ* double honour □ □ □ the *priviledge* of *Primogeniture*, being assigned as his *portion*, is an evidence thereof.

5. And the inconvenience that is here urged against that interpretation, is perfectly of no force. For 1. if from hence it might be concluded that a *Bishop* is worthy of double honour, though he never *preaches*, then from their interpreting it of the *Presbyter*, it will as much follow to be their opinion, that the *Presbyter* is worthy of double honour though he never *preach*.

6. But then secondly the truth is, that neither of these conclusions follow either the one or the other interpretation, for the first phrase of *labouring in the word*, and the other of *labouring in the doctrine* (which by these are confounded, and so express undistinctly by *preaching*) denote two severall things; the former the *planting* of the *faith* where it is not yet received, which is constantly express'd by *ἐκκαλεῖσθαι, κηρύττειν*, and *ἀγγεῖν*, *preaching the Gospel*, and the *word*; the latter signifies taking pains in a *Church* already gathered, for the *confirming* and farther *instructing* of *believers*. And then as he that doth one of these, may yet possibly not doe both, occasion not requiring, and so not be so eminently worthy of the double honour, as he that actually doth both; so certainly, he that *rules well* in any *Church*, and beside the care belonging to *rule*, undergoes that other double hard *travell* (so *κοπιῶν* signifies) of *preaching the faith* to *Infidels*, and *confirming*, and *instructing believers*, doth very highly deserve the double honour and *alimonie*; And this as it is the exact meaning of that *Text*, so it utterly supercedes all force of this objection or exception against our understanding it of the *Presidents* or *Bishops* in the *Prælati*cal sense.

7. Fourthly, For the word *Presbytery*, 1 *Tim.* 4. 14. by which they say, I understand *Episcopacy*, I answer, that I interpret it of some combination either of *Apostles* or *Apostolical persons* and

Bishops, τῶν τῆς ἀποστολικῆς χρείας ἀξιωμαίων in *Theodore's* phrase, (such as were vouchsafed the Apostolical grace, i. e. of *Paul* assuredly, 1 *Tim.* 2.6. and perhaps of *Barnabas*, perhaps of some other Apostolical person with him, in like manner as both *Peter* and *John* style themselves πρεσβύτεροι *Elders*, and * *Ignatius* styles the Apostles πρεσβυτεριον ἐκκλησίας the Presbytery or Eldership of the Church, and as of *Ignatius* himselfe *S. Chrysostome* affirms, μακαρίων Ἀποστόλων χεῖρας, that the hands of more Apostles than one were laid on him, in his ordination to the Bishoprick of Antioch.

* Ep. ad Philad;

To which matter the Scholion of *Chrysostome* is expresse, & πρεσβυτέρων φησι ταῦτα, ἀλλὰ πρεσβυτέρων ἐπισκόπων, he speaks not here of Presbyters but Bishops, adding the reason, because Presbyters did not ordaine Bishops, and so *Theophylact* and *Oecumenius*.

8.

Lastly for the other two places of not-rebuking and receiving an accusation against an Elder, though in those places it were clearly for my interest to interpret πρεσβύτεροι a Presbyter in our moderne sense, for then as * *Epiphanius* saith, there is an evidence of prooffe that the Bishop hath power over the Presbyter (ὡς ἔν πρεσβυτέροις ἐξουσίαν ἔχει) *Timothy* over the Elder, saith he, but never the Elder over *Timothy*: Yet I confesse my selfe inclined by other considerations to foregoe that advantageous sense of the place.

9.

Because *Timothy* being placed in the prime Metropolis had power over the Bishops of lesser Cities, and that, as hath oft been shewed, νεῖσιν as well as χειροτονίαν power of judging as well as of ordaining Bishops, which is * elsewhere evidenced to be the opinion of *S. Chrysostome*, in order to the understanding of this place. And so still the crime is not very great or reproachfull, which I am said to have confest, it amounts no higher than the former confession had done, that *Timothy* was Archbishop of Ephesus; and yet this you see without any necessity to extort it from thee, save that of speaking freely what I conceived most probable; For otherwise nothing could be more for the advantage of the maine cause I defend, than that πρεσβύτεροι Elders should signifie Presbyters in these two places.

10.

* Dissert. 4. c. 19. sect. 11, 12.

Sect. IX.

A fourth confession of Titus being Archbishop of Creet.

Num 1.

THEIR fourth charge is, that I am forced to confesse that Titus was Archbishop of Creet, and that he received no commission from S. Paul to ordaine single Elders, but onely for ordaining Bishops in every City. It seems, say they, this Author slights the Postscript, where Titus is called the first Bishop of Creet, and slights all those antient Fathers that are cited by his owne party, to prove that he was Bishop of Creet: But he must be an Arch-Bishop, and so must Timothy also, or else these assertions of his will fall to the ground. Now that they were neither Bishops nor Arch-Bishops hath beene sufficiently proved (as we conceive) in the former discourse.

2.

* Lib. 3. c. 4.

That Titus was Arch-Bishop of Creet, I confesse again that I cannot but believe, till I am shewed how the contrary were possible, i.e. how he that was fastned in (and, as * Eusebius saith, had ἐπισκοπῶν the Episcopacy of) a whole Island, which had an hundred Cities in it, and was there placed, that he might ordaine Bishops under him in each of those Cities, Tit. 1. 5. 7. and, as the antients adde, exercise jurisdiction over them, should be other than an Arch-Bishop.

3.

That this was his condition, hath been shewed already, And for the inconveniences that it is prest with, they will prove very supportable. For I shall not at all be obliged thereby to slight either Postscript or Fathers, but give the disputers example to pay them all reverence, being very well able to discern the Bishop through the Archbishop, & having never imagined that the styling Michael an Archangel was denying him to be an Angel. He certainly was an Angel, and that of an higher degree, or else could never have been justly called an Archangel; and 'tis just so with Titus, if I had not thought him a Bishop, I would never have affirmed him an Archbishop, and they that in common speech give him the title of Bishop, doe no way intimate their thoughts to be contrary to mine, for every Archbishop is certainly a Bishop, though every Bishop be not an Archbishop.

And

And therefore if all the danger of my assertions falling to the ground be consequent to this of *Titus* or *Timothies* proving to be no *Archbishop*, I shall deeme them competently safe, for each of them were unavoidably such, *Timothy Archbishop of Ephesus*, the prime *Metropolis* of all *Asia*, and *Titus* of the whole *Island of Creer*, and accordingly to those two, pecuiliarly as such, directions are given for the ordeining *Bishops* and *Deacons* in every *City*.

4.

And the proofes which were offered to the contrary, have I suppose already been answered, and being not here thought fit to be recited, the replies shall not be so impertinent, as to appeare without their antagonists. Onely because it is here inserted as part of my inconvenient confession, that *Titus* received no Commission from *Saint Paul* to ordaine single *Elders* (which I believe I no where say, any otherwise than that the Commission, cap. 1. 5. was to create *Bishops* in every *City*) I shal freely tell them my opinion of that, viz. that a greater power may very fitly be said to comprehend under it the lesser of the same kinde, and consequently that both *Timothy* and he which had Commissions to ordaine *Bishops* in every *City*, had also by the same commission power to ordaine single *Presbyters*, where those were usefull to be ordained, as is evident by the qualification of *Deacons* and *Widows* after-mentioned in one certainly, and, as I conceive, in both *Epistles*, for that supposeth their Commission to extend to the ordeining of those, who yet had not been named in them, if we may guesse by that of *Titus*, cap. 1. 5. And so much also of that part of my confession, which is as free and unforced, as the former had been, and I believe as safe to the asserter.

5.

Sect. X.

A first charge of contrariety to Scripture answered. Of visitation of the sick, belonging to Elders, James 5.

NUM. 1.

BUT the first and last charge is more severe than any of the former, that these *paradoxes*, as they stile them, are contrary to the very letter of the Scripture, as we have made it evident in our arguments against the *Jus Divinum of Episcopacy*, and would farther manifest it, if we thought it necessary.

2.

This I confesse of contrariety to the very letter of the Scripture (rightly understood) I lookt upon as so high a charge, that I verily expected somewhat extraordinary to binde it on me, and I suddenly resolved (as I read the first words of that Section) to examine those Scriptures that should now be produced, ponderingly and exactly, and either confesse my owne conviction, or give competent reasons why I was not convinced by them.

3.

But I soon found my expectations frustrated, for as herein no one such Scripture mentioned, so for their arguments against the *Jus Divinum of Episcopacy*, I know not where to seek them, and never heard (and verily believe there is no such thing) that they had formerly written any such Book against Bishops, wherein the *Dissertations* or any assertions of mine therein, were so much as arraign'd by them, much less evidenced to be contrary to the very letter of Scripture: If I had, I assure them I should then have been as ready to have made my reply, as now I have been to attend them thus farre.

4.

And for their evidencing this in any tract publisht by them before the *Dissertations* were written, by which notwithstanding the *Dissertations* were to be concluded, I have no reason to thinke that to be their meaning, because these assertions of mine are by them affirmed to be *Paradoxes*, contrary to all that have ever written in defence of *Episcopacy*, and therefore could not, unlesse it were by divination, be taken notice of, and prevented by them.

5.

After they had exprest their opinion that it was not necessary for

for them farther to manifest the contrariety of my Paradoxes to the very letter of the Scripture, they yet farther proceed in these words,

For When the Apostle saith, James 5. 14. Is any man sick among you? let him call for the Elders of the Church—who is there that can be perswaded to believe that all these Elders were Bishops (in the sense that Bishops are taken in in our dayes) Is this the proper worke of Bishops to visit the sick? And besides, if the Apostle by Elders had meant Bishops in that sense, he would have said, let him call for the Elders of the Churches, not of the Church, unlesse our brethren will say that there were divers Bishops in every Church in the Apostles dayes, in which there were many sick persons.

What the [For] in the front here signifies, I shall not goe about to conjecture, The antecedents would incline me to believe that it pretends to introduce a reason, which might make it evident that my assertions are contrary to the very letter of Scripture: But that sure it doth not any way attempt or appeare to doe, unlesse the *πρεσβύτεροι* Elders of the Church be supposed here to signifie Presbyters in our moderne notion of the word: But then that is so farre from being granted, that it is knowne to be the onely *ἐκκλησία*, the matter of question betwixt us all this while, and so was to be proved not supposed or presumed in this matter.

But bating them this begging of the Question, I shall proceed to satisfie their wonderment, that I should goe about to perswade any, that *πρεσβύτεροι* Elders, in this place of Saint James, were Bishops in that sense that we now understand and use the word.

And 1. I shall not doubt to avow, that for all that space, that in any Church there were no other officers ordained, but onely the Bishop and Deacon, it must of necessity be resolved the proper worke of Bishops to visit the sicke. That there was at the first, when the Faith was but thin planted, such a time hath already been evidenced out of *Clemens Romanus*, and the profoundest antiquities that *Epiphanius* could meet with, And that then this office must either be neglected, or performed by either Bishop or Deacon, will not need any farther proofe.

As

6.

7.

8.

9. As for the the *Deacons* in their institution, we finde not that to be any part of their office, and indeed the suitableness of *absolution* to that state of dangerous sicknesse, and the mention of *καὶ ἀμαρτίας ἡ πεποιμένος* his having committed sins, and the command of giving it (in case he be qualified for it) *ἀποδοῦναι αὐτῷ*, *absolvetur ei*, *absolution shall be given him*, doth render the *Deacon* incompetent for that worke, and so, where there are no *Presbyters*, must needs divolve it on the *Bishop*.

10. And this account hath more than probability, no lesse than perfect evidence in it, if we onely suppose what hath been so oft cleared from the *Antients* to be matter of fact, that where the number of *believers* was small, and none qualified for the office of *Presbyters*, there the *Apostles* constituted no more but a *Bishop* and a *Deacon* in each City. For whilst this was the state of that City, I shall suppose a man sick, and by the force of *S. James's* exhortation, desirous of *absolution*, &c. Who is there supposeable in that City to give it him but the *Bishop*? And whom else can he call to him for this purpose? And then who can doubt but this is the worke, in it selfe very agreeable, and in this supposed case peculiar and proper to the *Bishop*? so that unlesse this supposition be false, nay impossible to be true, I may safely say, this was or might be the *Bishops* worke, to visit the sick, &c.

11. And indeed, if it were not, how could it be by the *Bishop*, when other parts of his office became his fuller employment, committed to the *Presbyter*? For 1. he could not commit this to others, if he first had it not in himselfe; and Secondly, this was the onely reason of ordaining inferiour officers in the Church, that part of the *Bishop's* taske might be performed by them (as when the whole burthen, which was too heavy for *Moses*, was distributed among other men) which in this particular could not be, if before this assignation of *assistants*, it were not originally the *ἐξου* worke or proper taske of the *Bishop*.

12. To this may be farther added the reall dignity, because necessary charity of this performance of visiting the sick, &c. and this arising both from the intimation of *Gods* owne finger, pointing

pointing out this a most agreeable season for all *spirituall* admonition and *comfort*, a *molle tempus fandi*, wherein a word *seasonably* spoken, may most probably find the due *reception*, and wherein the *prayers* and *blessing* of the most *Apostolical* person, or the most *highly* and justly dignified in the *Church*, & in the favour of *God*, may come in most *opportunistically*, & in this respect we see in that place, that the *prayers* of the great *Prophet Elias* are made use of by *S. James*, to exemplifie the practice, which in this particular he recommended to the *Church*.

And I must needs tell the *Objectors*, that as meane an opinion as they seem to have of this work of *visiting the sick*, I cannot but *affirme* on the contrary, that if it were duely and advantageously managed, it were *extreamely* usefull and beneficiall to the good of *Soules*, and as proper for a *Bishop* personally to performe, when his other publick *necessarie* taskes (wherein many more are concern'd, and wherein he hath no *proxies* to supply his place) permit, as any one part of his *divine office*, differing from the rest only in this, (and in that respect yielding the *precedence* to them) that other parts of his *office* are, or may be at the same time *extensive* to many, whilst each act of this is terminated in some one, whose *soul* yet ought to be more *precious* in his eyes, than all other *acquisitions* in the world.

Accordingly it is in the * *Dissertations* evidenced out of *Polyearp's Epistle* (who was somewhat after the time of *James* the author of this *Epistle*) that part of the *Bishop's office* it was then esteemed to be, *ἐπισκέπτεσθαι πάντας ἀσθενῶντας*, to visit all the sick, in like manner as in *Iustin Martyr* he is made the *Curator* of all that are in want, the grand distributor of all the *liberalities* of the *Church*.

As for the onely *objection* that is here rendered against this interpretation of the place, from the *singular* [*ἐκκλησίας* of the *Church*] not of the *Churches*, the answer is obvious, that this *Epistle* of *James* being written to all the *Jewes* in dispersion, *Jam. 1. 1.* these could not make up any one particular *Church* of any single denomination, but yet all conjoyne very fitly in that one *Universal* style of *ἐκκλησία*, the *Church*. In this respect we know 'tis called the *Catholick Epistle* of *James*, because written to the whole *Church* of the *Jewes*, all

R

the

13.

14.
* *Dissert. 4. 21.*
22.

15.

the *believers* of that nation, wheresoever *disperst* out of their *Countrey*.

16. Now these inhabiting in *divers* Cities, it is as certaine there were *divers Bishops* in this *circuit*, and so the *πρεσβύτεροι* the *ἐκκλησίας*, the *Elders of the Church*, are most commodiously set to expresse these severall *Bishops*, belonging to this *complexe* body, the *Church* of the *dispersion*.

17. Not that there were more of these in *one City*, for that consideration would never have caused the *plural* expression, because were there never so *many*, the *sick person* needed not have called *more* at once (and upon that score I shall demand of them that argue from the *number*, was every *sick man* in their opinion, to call for the whole *Presbytery*?) nor againe because there were not as many *Churches* as *Elders*, but onely because these many *particular Churches*, of which there was an *equal* number of *Elders*, were very fitly comprehended under the one *general ἐκκλησία*, the *Church* in the singular *number*.

Se&. XI.

A last objection from A&. 21. 18. and 14. 3. and 11. 30. answered. Elders for Rulers or Bishops.

Num. 1.

THere yet remains one sort of *Objections* more against these *Paradoxes*, in these words.

Besides, when it is said, A&. 21. 18. Paul went in with us unto James, and all the Elders were present, It is supposed by our Episcopall men, that James was at this time Bishop of Jerusalem. Now we demand, who were these Elders? were these also Bishops of Jerusalem? Will this answer consist with our brethrens judgement? so likewise when it is said, A&. 15. 4. And when they were come to Jerusalem, they were received of the Church, and of the Apostles and Elders, we demand, what is meant by the Church? Is it not meant the Church of Jerusalem, to which place they are said to come? And if so, then we ask further, what is meant by the Elders? Must it not be answered, that by Elders are meant the Elders of Jerusalem? And then let any man tell us, how these Elders

Elders can be said to be Bishops in a Prelatical sense, especially according to the sense of our brethren, who make James to be at this time the only Bishop of Jerusalem. Adde farther, It is said, Act. 14. 3. When Paul and Barnabas had ordained them Elders in every Church, Act. 11. 30. They sent relieve to the Elders, &c. Can any imagine that this relieve was sent only to Bishops, and that Paul and Barnabas ordained no Presbyters in any Church, but only Bishops? Is not this to offer manifest violence to the Scriptures? and instead of upholding of Episcopacie, is not this sufficient to render it odious and contemptible to all sober, and godly, and moderate Christians? But we forbear.

It seems we have still remaining another heape of inconvenient Confessions that we labour under; And upon them, more socratico, they make their demands; And although I might justly wonder why they which have read the Dissertations, and know what answer I give to every of their demands, should be at the trouble to aske them againe, yet because I am resolved not to be weary of attending them, I shall answer them as punctually as they could wish, and patiently support all the odium that will result from thence, among all sober, and godly, and moderate Christians.

Here onely I desire two things may be remembred, which have already been evidenced, 1. that the word *πρεσβύτεροι* Elders in the style of the Old Testament, in the continued use of all languages, being an exprellion of power and dignity, is in the New Testament upon all reasonable accounts as properly applicable to the Rulers and Governours Ecclesiastical, as the word Apostles, or Bishop, or Presidents, or Rulers, or any the like would be thought to be, and withall very fit to expresse single Rulers in each particular Church (in case any such may otherwise appeare to be mentioned in Scripture) there being no propriety in the word, or peculiarity in the usage of it, to incline it to joynt power of Collegues ruling in common.

Accordingly evidences have been produced in the Dissertations to shew the continuance of this usage among Authors after the Scripture-time, that it long remained in the language of the Antients, Polycarpe, Papias, Irenaeus, Clemens Alexandrinus,

drinus and *Tertullian*, many of which are knowne and by the *adversaries* acknowledged to assert *Episcopacy* in our moderne sense, and yet use the word *Πρεσβύτεροι* *Elders*, to denote sometimes the *Apostles*, sometimes the singular *Bishops* in each Church.

5. And therefore the affirming this one thing, so attested and confirmed, viz. that the word *Πρεσβύτεροι* may very conveniently be interpreted *Bishops*, as oft as the circumstances of the *Text* will beare it, will not, I hope, still be so unfortunate as to fall under the *censure* of *Paradoxe* and odious, being indeed a plaine obvious observation, which hath nothing of difficulty or harshnesse in it.

6. Having premised this, I shall onely adde, that the *Apostles* being by all *Prælatists* (I hope convincingly) affirmed and proved to have ordained *Bishops* in every *City* of *Converts* and *proselytes* to the *Faith*, and there being many such *Cities* in *Judea*, besides *Jerusalem*, and consequently many *Bishops* in those *Cities*, one in each, it can be no new thing to conclude, that when we read of *Bishops* in the plural within that pale of *Judea*, these are the *Bishops* of *Judea*, and so in like manner when we finde the *Bishop* of *Jerusalem* mentioned separately, and then those others with him, (expressed by any title which signifies *Bishops*, be it *ἐπίσκοποι* or *Πρεσβύτεροι* it matters not) and with all, these never exprest to be *Πρεσβύτεροι ἐκκλησίας Ἱερουσαλήμ* *Elders of the Church of Jerusalem*, but either *Elders* simply, or else *in* or *at* *Jerusalem*, denoting onely the place, where, at that time, they were present, it will be as little harsh to inferre, that at such time there were assembled or met together at *Jerusalem*, *James* the *Bishop* of that *Metropolis*, and the other *Bishops* of the whole region, the *Bishops* of *Judea* with him.

7. From hence there will now be no difficulty to make a briefe answer to each of their demands, 1. that *Act. 21. 18.* the *Elders* which were present with *James* the *Bishop* of *Jerusalem*, were the *Bishops* of *Judea* which were then, upon the emergent affaires of the Church, present at *Jerusalem*, whether all of them assembled in *Conncel*, to receive an account of *Saint Pauls* transactions and successes among the *Gentiles*,

rules v. 19. or many of them on any other Ecclesiasticall concernment.

But that which puts it out of question, that it was all of them in Councell, is, what followes v. 25. where they referre to the decrees which had been conciliarly delivered v. 15. by them, who are now there present, we have written and concluded. And what Paradox can there be in this, that all the Bishops of Judea should be in Councell at Hierusalem, and St Peter and St. John with them, and that St. Paul should come and give an account of his traavailes and actions in their presence.

8.

The same answer certainly belongs to the place next mentioned c. 15. 4. where after mention of their Reception by the Church, followes [and of the Apostles and Elders] by the Church is meant the Believers that were at Jerusalem, whether inhabiting there continually, or now occasionally present there. By the Apostles, James the Brother of the Lord, the then Bishop of the Metropolis, together with Peter and John the known Apostles of Christ, this James by them set over that Church, saith * Clemens and † Hegesippus, and by S. Paul himself reckoned among the Apostles, Gal. 1. 19. and so in the title of his Epistle, and named before Peter and John the two prime Apostles, as being in this his See, Gal. 2. 9. and exprest to pronounce the decree in the Councell, 'Εγὼ κείνῳ, I judge, Act. 15. 19. and this confirm'd by the testimonies of those Antients that the Presbyterians make the most frequent use of, Theodoret and * St. Hierome; the former expressly affirming of those times, that they which were after styled Bishops, were then called Apostles, and the latter styling this James particularly, Apostolum decimum tertium, the thirteenth Apostle.

* Ἰακώβος, 1. 6.
† Ἰερογλυμῆς.

* Commun. in
1/a.

And then what can be more agreable to the Context (to make the Councell complete, a Councell for the Churches of Syria, &c. to appeale to) then to render the Elders the Bishops of all Judea, which were certainly fitter for the turne to joyne in the Councell, and give Law to other Cities, then the bare Presbyters of the one City of Jerusalem could have been esteemed, if any such there had been in the Church so early.

10.

11. For though of the *Apostles*, who had an *universall* jurisdiction, and of the *Bishop* of *Jerusalem* (as that was the *prime Metropolis* not only of *Judea*, but *Syria* also) with the *Bishops* of the whole *Province* in *Councell* with him, some reasonable account may be given, why they should be consulted by the *Church* of *Antioch*, and give binding decrees in that matter, to all that were subject to that *Metropolis*, yet supposing the *Church* of *Jerusalem* to be governed by *Presbyters*, and that (as these say) the *Elders* mentioned in the *Councell* were none but the *Presbyters* of that particular *Church*, there could no reasonable account be given, why they should joyn with the *Apostles* in this worke, wherein not *Jerusalem*, of which alone they were *Presbyters*, but *Antioch* and other *Cities* of *Syria* and *Cilicia* were immediately concerned, and concluded by the sentence of *James*, that must be, (according to their opinion) of one of the *Presbyters* of *Jerusalem*.

12. In the next place what is said of *Act. 14.23.* and *Act. 11.30.* is somewhat unhappily put together, and yet not rectified in the *Errata*. For 1. the ordaining *Elders* in every *Church* to which *Act. 11.30.* is affixt, is not mentioned there, but *Act. 14.23.* and the sending reliefe, which in the *Syntaxes* must be affixt to *Act. 14.23.* is not to be met with there, but *Act. 11.30.* But this were imputable to some haste either of *Scribe* or *Compositor*, were there not a second incongruity interweaved in it, viz. that when *Paul* and *Barnabas* had ordained them *Elders*, &c. (which was not done till *Act. 14.23.*) They sent reliefe to the *Elders*, (which was done *Act. 11.30.*) which is an evident *παραδοξασμὸς* which I cannot discern how it was usefull for them to be guilty of.

13. As for their *Quæres* raised on these two *Texts*, the *Answers* are obvious, and here to be translated out of the *Dissertations* as formerly, that the *πρεσβύτεροι* *Elders* *Act. 11.30.* are the *Bishops* of the severall *Cities* of *Judea*, not the *Presbyters* of that one *City Jerusalem*.

14. For 1. the famine that occasioned this charity of the *Antiochians*, was ἐν ὅλῳ τῷ οἰκουμενῶν, not upon *Jerusalem* alone, but all the *World*, i.e. in the *Scripture*-stile, *Ln. 21.26.*

Rom.

Rom. 10. 18. over the whole Land of Judea, according to the manner of the *Septuagint*, who oft render *הארץ* the earth or the Land, when it signifies the Land of Judea, by *διὰ παντός* the World, As *Isa.* 10. 23. and 13. 5. 9. and 24. 1. and accordingly *Josephus* saith of this time of *Claudius's* Reigne *μὴ γὰρ ἄλλοτε καὶ τὴν Ἰουδαίαν γένεσθαι*, that there was a great famine over Judea.

Secondly, the charity is distinctly said to be designed by the Donors, *τοῖς καλοῦντοσιν ἐν Ἰουδαίᾳ ἀδελφοῖς*, to the brethren that dwell in Judea, in no wise confined to Jerusalem, nor consequently can the Elders to whom it was sent, and in whose hands it was put, be any others than the Elders, i.e. say we, Bishops of all Judea.

15.

Thirdly, it is very agreeable to the office of Bishops, as we find the practice in the *Primitive Church*, to be the receivers and stewards and dispensers of the wealth of any sect, which was brought in to the Church, whether by the offertory of the faithful in the Sacrament, or by the liberality of other Churches, enlarged to those that were in want. It being *Justin Martyr's* affirmation of the first times, that all the offerings were brought to the *Προσβάς* or President, and that he was thereby made *ἐκτελεστὴς* the Curator of all that were in want.

16.

And when what is sent to the Bishop is supposed to be sent to him, as the *Oeconomus* or steward of the Church, not for the enriching himself, but to provide for those that wanted, I cannot imagine why this may not be as conveniently supposed, as that it should be sent to the Presbyters only.

17.

So in like manner the *Προσβύτεροι* *Act.* 14. 23. are Bishops againe, and such and only such (as farre as we have any footsteps of it) were at that time ordained in the Churches, one in every City where the Gospel was received with one or more Deacons to attend him.

18.

And to this as the words so often mentioned out of *Clement Romanus* are most evident, that the Apostles of Christ preaching through Cities and Regions, constituted their first fruits *εἰς ἐπισκόπους καὶ διακόνους* for Bishops and Deacons, so the

19.

context

context in this place of the *Acts* is very agreeable : For here when *Paul* and *Barnabas* had *preacht* and converted a competent number at *Derbe*, v. 12. and returned to the *Cities* of *Lystra*, *Iconium* and *Antioch* v. 22. confirming the *soules* of the *brethren*, i.e. the *faithfull*, there it followes, before their parting, that they ordained *Elders* καὶ ἐκκλησίας in every Church, that sure is in every of the Churches here named, not many in each, but *Elders* in all, one *Bishop* in every Church, which again is no news for me or any *Prelatist* to affirm, when in the *Epistle* to *Titus*, St. *Paul's* direction is conformable to his *practice*, appointing him to ordaine *Elders* κατὰ πόλιν, City by City, or in every City, c. 1. 5. and presently calling the *Elder* so to be ordained *Bishop*, as in the *Epistle* to *Timothy* he is also called.

20.

Thus much paines I shall not grudge to have taken, if it be but to rescue a small *booke*, very innocently meant, from the charge of two such *Paradoxes*, as they are called by those, who have not thought fit to believe them, and are as unwilling that others should, and therefore conclude their discourse against them with *tragicall expressions* of offering manifest violence to the *Scriptures*, of being sufficient, instead of upholding *Episcopacy*, to render it odious and contemptible, &c. And when they have said so much with so little weight of reason to justify it, they will then part with all meeknesse and perfect temper [but we forbear] i. e. abstaine to adde more, when they had said as much ill as could be. I am sorry there was still any more bitterness within, to be suppressed, when there was so much vented. However it is, we are now at end of a second post, and to have time to breath a while after some lassitude.

C H A P.

CHAP. III.

Concerning the Opinion of Antiquity in this Question.

Sect. I.

The Testimonies of Clemens Romanus, Bishops and Deacons the onely offices at the first. Corinth Metropolis of Achaia. What $\chi\acute{o}\rho\alpha$, signifies. The Apostles care to prevent contentions about Episcopacy. Hegesippus's testimony of the contentions at Corinth. Clement a Bishop.

Some things there are yet behind in their Appendix, Num 1.
 Swherein I discern my selfe to be concern'd, in some directly and immediately, in others by remoter obligation, as when some of those testimonies of Antiquity, which are in the Dissertations manifested to be perfectly reconcileable with our pretensions, and some of them evident confirmations of them, are yet by these Writers crudely taken up, and made use of, as Testimonies on their side, without ever taking notice of that which is said in the Dissertations to cleare the contrary.

Of the former sort, wherein I am more immediately pointed at, there are *four* things. First, Concerning one testimony of St. Hierome. Secondly, concerning Ignatius his Epistles in generall, and the appeales that I make to his authority, which they will not allow to have force with them. Thirdly, concerning one testimony cited by them out of St. Ambrose on Ephes. 4. and answered by me, but that answer disliked and rejected by them. Fourthly, concerning the Chorepiscopi. Of the second sort, are the testimonies out of Clemens Romanus, Polycarpe, Irenaus, and Tertullian, especially the two former of them. 2.

I shall therefore briefly survey every one of these, and I suppose I have pitcht on the most convenient Method (and that which will give the Reader the clearest view both of the judgement of Antiquity concerning Episcopacy in generall 3.

(to which their *Appendix* professeth wholly to be designed) and more particularly of the truth of those *two* propositions which have been accused as *Paradoxes* in me, but will now appeare not to be such) by taking these *testimonies*, as they lie in the order of *time*, wherein the *Authors* lived, and then that of *St. Hierome*, which happens to be first mentioned by them, p. 102. will fall to be one of the *last* to which we shall make reply.

4.
P. 104.

Clem. ad Corin.
P 54.

First then for *Clemens*, they thus begin, *sure we are that Clemens, who lived in the first century, in his famous Epistle to the Corinthians (an undoubted piece of antiquity) makes but two Orders of Ministry, Bishops and Deacons.* And having set downe the place which testifies this, * *καὶ χρεὶς ἐν ἡ πόλει κηρύσσας καθίσταν τὰς ἀρχαὶς αὐτῶν, δοκιμάσαντες τὸ πνεῦμα, ὡς ἐπισκόπους καὶ διακόνους τῶν πολλῶν πιστῶν,* and rendered it thus, *Christ Iesus sent his Apostles through Countreys and Cities, in which they preached and constituted the first fruits (approving them by the Spirit) for Bishops and Deacons to those who should afterwards believe* From hence they observe, p. 105. *That Bishops and Deacons were the onely orders of Ministry in the first Primitive Church. And that the Apostles appointed but two Officers (that is Bishops and Deacons) to bring men to believe, because when he had reckon'd up three Orders appointed by God amongst the Jewes, High-Priest, Priests, and Levites: coming to rectifie Orders appointed by the Apostles under the Gospell, he doth mention onely Bishops and Deacons.*

5.

And here one would thinke were little for the *Presbyterians* advantage, even no more than one of my *Paradoxes* would have afforded them, which, from this very *testimony* and some other, concluded that which was then so *strange* for them to heare (yet now can be confest by them) that the *Apostles* at their first *plantations* contented themselves with *Bishops and Deacons*, one of each, or perhaps more of the latter in every *City*.

6.

But when these men thus grant the *conclusion* from this place, which I infer'd, I have yet no reason to boast of their *liberality*, because I suppose it their meaning, that by *Bishops* *Clement* meant

meant *Presbyters*, though this they do not so much as say in twice repeating of their *conclusion*.

And yet certainly it needed more than *saying*, proving by some evidence or argument, that *Ἐπίσκοποι Bishops* in that place signifies any thing else but *Bishops*. All that they offer toward a *reason* for this, must be contained in these words of theirs that follow in the former place.

The occasion of that *Epistle* seemes to be a new sedition raised by the Corinthians against their *Presbyters*, p. 57. 58. *Clemens* to remove their present sedition tell them how God hath alwayes appointed severall orders in his Church, which must not be confounded; in the Jewish Church he appointed High-Priest, Priests and Levites, And then tells them for the time of the Gospel that Christ Jesus sent his Apostles as before, citing the words of *Clement* already set down.

But certainly this doth not prove *Bishops* in that *Epistle* to be no more than *Presbyters*, but may as fitly be argumentative for me, that *Πρεσβύτεροι Elders* in that *Epistle* signifie *Bishops*. The onely imaginable medium of prooffe, which can be usefull for their turne, I shall suppose to be this, that Corinth was but one City, and therefore *Πρεσβύτεροι Elders* at, and of Corinth, must needs be *Presbyters*, because according to our opinion there were not more *Bishops* in one City.

But to this I answer, 1. That what *Clemens* saith in the testimony now produced, he speakes not of Corinth peculiarly, but of the Cities, and Regions in generall, which the Apostles converted, and of them in the plurall number, κατὰ χώρας καὶ πόλεως, through Regions and Cities, and then in those many Cities, there may well be many *Bishops*, and yet certainly no more than one in one City.

Secondly, that this *Epistle* of *Clemens* to the Corinthians was not to the Christians of that one City, but to the whole Province of Achaia, of which Corinth was the Metropolis, and wherein the Proconsull of Achaia resided, and kept his Courts, Act. 18. 12. 15. So the Title of the *Epistle* inclines, being inscribed to the Church *κατακλιθεὶς Κόρινθον*, which denotes the whole Province, then called *αχαΐαν*, as when in

7.

8.

9.

10.

11.

* L. 4 c. 23.

Polycarps Epistle, the Church *παγκόσια Φιλίπποις*] is not onely that of the City *Philippi*, but of the Province belonging to it, and in the other part of the title of this *Epistle*, *Ἐκκλησία θεῆς παγκόσια Ρωμῶν*, the Church of God dwelling about Rome,] in the Church of Rome, and all that belonged to that *Metropolis*, called by *Ignatius* τῶν ὁρίων Παμδαίον, the place of the Region of the Romans, i. e. the City, and the whole Region about it; And so when *Eusebius* mentions *Dionysius* the famous Bishop of Corinth, he calls him Bishop τῆς ἐν Κορίνθῳ παρχίας, of the Province of, or about Corinth.

12.

And that this is the truth of it, and no conjecture of mine may appeare by one character in the *Epistle*; He tells them that they had formerly received *Epistles* from St. Paul. This directs to resolve that these to whom this *Epistle* was addrest, were the same to whom St. Paul's were formerly sent, And it is evident that those were the Saints or Christians in all Achaia, 2 Cor. 1. 1. And the same is doubtlesse implied by the phrase in every place, 1 Cor. 1. 2. not in every place simply of the World (for it was no Catholick *Epistle*, but a particular admonition for particular faults, incest, &c.) but in that whole Province or Region of Achaia. So that which *Apollos* is said to have done among them (*Apollos hath watered*) 1 Cor. 3. 6. appeares by the story Act. 18. 27. to have belonged to all Achaia. And so what the *Apostle* writes to them of sending their offertory to Judaea, 1 Cor. 6. 1. 2 Cor. 8. and 9. doth appeare by Rom. 15. 26. to appertaine to all Achaia, Macedonia, saith he, and Achaia have pleased to make a contribution, and 2 Cor. 9. 2. I know your forwardnesse, that Achaia hath been ready above a yeare agoe. Where the [ὁμῶν you] and [Achaia] must needs be of the same latitude, and so againe it is c. 11. 9. compared with v. 18. And so those of St. Paul, and consequently this of *Clement* was not to the City of Corinth alone, but to all the Churches of Achaia, and if among them there were more Bishops than one, there will certainly be no newes in that, and if those Bishops (according both to the nature of the word, and the use of it in those dayes before and after *Clement*) were styled some.

sometimes *ἐπισκοποι*, sometimes *πρεσβύτεροι* also, then all is very agreeable to all that we contend for, that there was *one Bishop*, not a College of Presbyters in Clements dayes in every City.

And this is directly the importance of Clements words, as they lie in the *Epistle*, ἐξετύχθη, saith he, ὁ χριστός ἀπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ, καὶ οἱ ἀπόστολοι ἀπὸ χριστοῦ, *Christ was sent out from God, and the Apostles from Christ* (*As my Father sent me, so send I you*) And then to shew that the Bishops were in the same manner sent, i. e. *commissionated* by them, he addes, that they, i. e. the *Apostles* ἐξῆλθον ἐν ἐπαγγελίᾳ καὶ πόλεσι, καὶ χωραῖς, &c. *Therefore Preaching through Regions and Cities, they constituted their first fruits—for Bishops and Deacons, Cities and Regions in the Plurall, and Bishops and Deacons proportionable thereto.*

13.

And when he addes that they were thus made of their *first fruits*, i. e. of those that were first converted by them, and to this end, that they might be officers of those which should *after believe* (supposing that there were not many now that did so) this is directly a description of those times, of which *Epiphanius* speakes, saying, that when the Gospel began to be Preacht, there was yet no neede of Presbyters, but Bishops and Deacons served the turne.

14.

And accordingly *Deacons* in those dayes were immediately made *Bishops*, as is sufficiently knowne of *Clement* the *Writer* of this *Epistle*, who was *St. Peters Deacon* and *Bishop* after him, as is cleared in *Dissert 5. c. 1. Sect. 11.* And so much for that *first testimony.*

15.

One thing onely more from hence they are desirous to conclude, that in the first and purest times the custome was to choose Bishops in Villages, as well as in great Cities, grounded upon this, that here the *Apostles* are said to have appointed Bishops καὶ χωραῖς, as well as καὶ πόλεσι.

16.

But there is no ground of this conclusion in this testimony, For 1. here is no mention of *villages*, χωραῖς is not Greek for

17

them, but χωμαί, and 'tis the former, not the latter which here we finde. It is evident what is meant by χωμαί, when it is joyned with πόλεις *Cities*, viz. *Provinces*, which have each of them many *Cities* in them, and when it is joyned with χωμαί *Villages*, it fitly denotes *Regions*, in which there are many *Villages*.

18. So saith * *Strabo of Asia*, Ῥωμαῖοι ἱστᾶσι τὴν ἀπὸ τοῦ ἑαυτοῦ χωμαί, the Romans made that Region a Province, and so in the Ecclesiastical writings χωμαί is a Province made up of many *Cities*, each of which had a Bishop over them, as when in the * *Conncel in Trullo*. Κυρεῖται δὲ Ἀρχιεπισκοπὴ τῆς Ἀφρικανικῆς χωμαί, Cyprian is said to be Archbishop of the Region of the Africans, Region there signifying the whole Province under that Metropolitane, and so * Cyprian himselfe makes it his observation, Jampridem per omnes provincias & singulas urbes instituti sunt Episcopi. Antiently through all the Provinces and each of the Cities, Bishops were instituted. Where the Bishops in the several Provinces, as those differ from the Bishops in each City, are undoubtedly Archbishops.

19. And if that place so very agreeable to this of *Clemens* may be allowed, to give us the meaning of it, we see what it will be, and how distant from these mens conclusion that the Apostles instituted Bishops in every City, and in each Region or Province, and in the Metropolis or chiefe City of it, a Metropolitane or Archbishop.

20. But then 2. if χωμαί should signifie, as they would have it, a company of villages or little townes lying neer together, so as to be here used in opposition to the Cities, yet could it not be from hence concluded, that the Apostles constituted Bishops in those villages. The words are, they preached through regions and Cities, and constituted their first fruits (earliest converts) into Bishops and Deacons, which will be perfectly true, though all the Bishops and Deacons constituted by them, had their first seats of residence in the Cities; For that they constituted Bishops in the Regions, is not here affirmed.

21. Much more might be said in this matter, to shew that the utmost concessions that the adversaries could demand from hence, would no way hinder or disadvantage our pretensions, but

but only give the *Chorepiscopi* a greater *Antiquitie* in the Church, than either they or we have reason to thinke they had, of which whole matter the reader may see a full discourse, *Dissert.* 3. c. 8. *Sect.* 25. &c. and of it somewhat we shall anon have occasion to repete from thence.

The second Testimony of *Clemens* is set down by them in these words, That the Apostles knowing by *Iesus Christ* that there would a contention arise, τὰ ἐνομαζόμενα ἐπισκοπῆς about the name of Bishop, & being indued with perfect foreknowledge they appointed the aforesaid (that is, the aforesaid orders of Bishops and Deacons) &c. Here they require two things to be noted 1. that by name is not meant the bare name of Bishop, but the honour and dignity, as it is taken, *Phil.* 2. 9. *Ephes.* 1. 21. *Heb.* 1. 4. *Rev.* 11. so that ἐν τῷ ἐνομαζόμενῳ ἐπισκοπῆς, The controversie among the Corinthians was not about the name, but dignity of Episcopacy; for it was about the deposition of their godly Presbyters, pag. 57. 58. 2. That the only remedy appointed by the Apostles for the cure of all contentions arising about Episcopacy, is, by committing the care of the Church to Bishops and Deacons: Afterwards the Church found out another way, by setting up one Bishop over another; But *Clemens* tells us, that the Apostles indued with perfect foreknowledge of things ordained only Bishops and Deacons for a remedy of Schismes.

To this they adde (to supersede farther citations out of this Epistle) It would be too long to recite all that is said in this Epistle for the justification of our proposition, let the Reader peruse pag. 57. 62. 69. 72. and take notice that those which are called Bishops in one place are called Presbyters in another, and that they are ἐπισκοποῦντες throughout the whole Epistle.

What this whole Epistle will yield toward the proof of their proposition, which is, [That after Christs Ascension the Church of God for a certaine space of time, was governed by a Common Councell of Presbyters without Bishops] I thinke it reasonable for any that hath not read it, to conjecture by these two testimonies, which these, who assert the proposition, and here undertake to prove it, have thought fit to cull out of it, having withall nothing more to collect for their turne from the rest of the Epistle, particularly from the comparing those four pages, 57. 62. 69. 72. but only this, that they which are called Bishops.

Bishops in one place, are called *πρεσβύτεροι Elders* in another.

25. Now this last they know is the very thing that I contend (as from the *Scripture*, so) from this and other *antient* writings, that *ἐπίσκοπος* and *πρεσβύτερος*, [*Bishop and Elder*] are words of the same *importance*; all the question is, whether at the first *both* imported *Bishops* or both *Presbyters* in our *moderne* notion. That there is no one circumstance so much as offered by them to consideration, which may incline it their way, is evident by their owne words, neither of their *two notes* pretending to it, only their *conclusion* affirming, that they are *ἰσοδυναμία*, words of the same *importance*. The whole matter therefore will still divolve to this one *Quare*, whether, when *Clement* saith of the *Apostles* that they constituted none but *Bishops* and *Deacons*, by *Bishops* a *College* of *Presbyters* in every *City* be to be understood, or rather one *Bishop*, with his *Deacon* or *Deacons* in every *City*.

26. For the clearing of this one difficulty (for this being evinced, all that their *two notes* affirme, is directly on our side against them) I shall here intirely set downe the whole place last produced, of which they have left out one halfe. It is thus, Οἱ Ἀπόστολοι ἡμῶν ἔγνωσαν διὰ τῆς Κυρίας ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ χρεῖς, ὅτι θεῖς ἔσαι ὅτι τῷ ὀνόματι τῆς ἐπισκοπῆς: διὰ ταῦτ' αὖ ἐν ἀλλίᾳ, πείγουσιν εἰληφότες τελείαν, καλέσσαν τὰς πειρημένους (ἐπισκόπους ἢ διακόνους τῶν μελλόντων τισεύειν) ἡμεῖς αὖ ἐπινομήντες δεδῶκασιν, ὅπως, ἕαν κοιμηθῶσι, διαδέξονται ἑτέροι δεδοκιμασμένοι ἀνδρες πλὴν λειψυγίας αὐτῶν. Our Apostles knew by our Lord Jesus Christ (that must be by revelation from him) that there would contention arise upon the name or dignity of *Episcopacie* (i. e. about the authority of *Bishops* in the Church, some opposing it, and casking them out of their Offices, as here in the Church of the *Corinthians*, and through all *Achaia* was actually come to passe at this time, and occasioned this *Epistle* to them) For which cause therefore the Apostles having received perfect foreknowledge (that there would be such contentions on this occasion) did (for the preventing of them) constitute the forementioned (*Bishops* and *Deacons* of those which should come into the Faith in their new plantations) and after them (so

μεταξὺ signifies in *Barnabas's Epistle*, Sect. 10. λαὸς ὁ μεταξὺ the people that should be after, and εἰς τὸ μεταξὺ, Act. 13. 42. that which should follow the next after) gave a Series or Catalogue, or manner of succession (i.e. set downe a note of them which in each Church should succede the present Incumbent) that when they dyed, other approved men might succede to their office or ministry.

What can be more manifest, than that the dignity, which the Apostles conferred on the Bishops in each City and Province, which in the former Testimony hath been cleared to belong to single Bishops, not to any College of Presbyters, was by them foreseen, that it would be matter of Contention, occasion of Sedition in the Church: for the prevention of which, they used the probablest meanes imaginable, named successors to the present Bishops in every Church, who should supply the vacant places, as soon as they fell, and so prevent suing and contending for them, and were by the speciall spirit of God directed, who those successors should be; so that the opposing their succession, or casting them out afterwards, must be a great sin, even of resisting the spirit of God, who had designed them to this inheritance. Which, next to Christ's bearing them in his right hand, Rev. 1. 20. is the greatest character of dignity, and evidence of Christ's approving of the Order, and care of continuing it, as the originall of union (not division) in the Church.

27.

There is not by these men one word of objection offered against this conclusion, thus formerly deduced in the Dissertations, and therefore I need adde no more for the vindicating this testimony, yet will it not be amisse here to interpose the words of Hegeſippus, one that was present at the time of that sedition, and gives an account of it in * Eusebius, ἐπέμωρεν, saith he, ἐν τῷ ὁρθῷ λόγῳ ἡ ἐκκλησία τῶν Κορινθίων μετὰ Πριμου ἐπισκοπεύουσα ἐν Κορίνθῳ, The Church of the Corinthians continued in the right, untill Primus was Bishop of Corinth. Which is a testimonie as antient as that of Clement, and tells us what Bishops they were which Clement speakes of, such as Primus was at Corinth, i. e. one singular Governour in a City.

28.

* L. 4. c. 12.

The same will be yet more manifest, if we consider what by

29.

all *Authors* is affirmed of *Clemens* himselfe, the *writer*, at the time of writing this *Epistle*, that having been *Saint Paul's* fellow-labourer, *Phil.* 4. 3. *Saint Peter's* Deacon (*Ignat. in Ep. ad Trall.*) he was now *Bishop* of *Rome*, by the joynt suffrage of *Irenaeus* and all the *Antients*, even of *Saint Jerome* himselfe in his *Catalogue*, and by him stiled an *Apostolical* person on *Isa.* 52. a companion of the *Apostles* (in *Interp. Com. Orig. in Rom.*) and by *Clemens Alexandrinus*, *Strom. lib. 4. an Apostle* in the sense that *Theodoret* saith, those whom in his time they called *Bishops*, had been at first called *Apostles*.

30. Accordingly of him, saith *Irenaeus* in his *Catalogue* of the successive *Governors* of the *Church*, τέταρτος δὲ Ἀποστόλων τῷ ἐπισκοπῶν κληροῦται Κλήμης, in the third place from the *Apostles* *Clemens* came to the *Bishoprick*, Which how it is easily to be accorded with those who truly make him *Peters* immediate successor, see *Dissert. 5 c. 1. Sect. 6. &c.*

31. Other testimonies there are producible from this *Epistle* of *Clement*, which are all to the same purpose with the former; As when he findes an image of the *Ecclesiasticall* state under *Bishops* and *Deacons*, in the prophetic of *Isaiah*, cap. 60. 17. where in the *Greek* translation, then in use, he had read καλῶς ἐπισκόπους αὐτῶν ἐν δικαιοσύνῃ, καὶ τοὺς διακόνους αὐτῶν ἐν πίσει, I will constitute their *Bishops* in righteousnesse, and their *Deacons* in faithfulnessse, speaking of the *Judges* and their *Ministers* and officers in every *City*.

32. And so againe when he exhorts them to give due honour to the *Elders* among them, talkes of their sedition against their *Elders*, and casting them out of their *Episcopacy*, in one place (ἐπισκοτῆς ἀποβάλλειν) and removing them from that honoured office (ἐπιμανθόντες λειτουργίας μεταγαγῶν) in another, and the like; All of the same importance, and to be interpreted by the former.

Sect. II.

The Testimony of Polycarpe. That he was himselfe a Bishop. His mention of Ignatius's Epistles, fit to give authority to them, being so confirmed as it is by a series of the Antients.

IN the next place follows their testimonie out of *Polycarpe*, Num. 1. introduced in this manner,

The like Record we have of Polycarpe that famous Disciple of John the Apostle, who lived also within the first century, and wrote an Epistle to the Philippians; in which he makes also but two Orders of Ministry, Bishops and Deacons, and perswades the Philippians to be subject to their Presbyters and Deacons, as to God and Christ.

To this *Testimony* from *Polycarp* there is no reason I should deny any part of my assent, being so perfectly such, as the cause which I defend requires; If there be with him but two orders of Ministry, Bishops and Deacons, and he perswades the Philippians (i.e. that whole Province, the same to which Saint Paul had written, consisting of many Churches, all under that Metropolis of Philippi) to be subject to their πρεσβυτεροι and δακονοι, Elders and Deacons, and sets the former of them, in the comparison, to answer God the Father the supream Monarch of Heaven; and the latter to be the parallel to Christ who came out from Heaven upon his Fathers messages, then what reason have I to doubt, but that these Elders and Deacons are the very same which Saint Paul had called Bishops and Deacons, Phil. i. 1. which that it belonged to the severall Bishops of that Province of Macedonia, hath before been sufficiently vindicated.

And therefore without farther debating this *Testimony*, I shall adde some few things concerning this *Polycarp*, which will helpe conveniently to cleere the whole matter.

First, That as it is most true, that is here said of him, that he was a famous Disciple of John the Apostle, so this is added to his titles by the authentick Epistle of the Church of Smyrna,

Οὗτος γέγονεν ὁ θαυμασιώτατος ἐν τοῖς καὶ ἡμοῖς χριστοῖς,

διδάσκαλῳ Ἀποστολικῷ καὶ περρελικῷ γενόμῳ. *This was the most wonderfull person in our times, being an Apostolicall and Prophetical Doctor, and that he was a most glorious Martyr, is the designed matter of that whole Epistle.*

5. Secondly, That this famous, most admirable Apostolical Doctor and Martyr, was the Bishop of Smyrna, and so constituted by the Apostles, as will appeare by three Testimonies, each of them irrefragable. 1. By the Epistle of that Church of Smyrna, written on purpose concerning his Martyrdome, a reverend piece of Antiquity, fit to compare with any that remains in the Church. And there we finde in the close of his titles, Ἐπίσκοπός τε τῆς ἐν Σμύρνῃ καθολικῆς Ἐκκλησίας, that he was Bishop of the Catholike Church, which is in Smyrna, i. e. both of Jewish and Gentile Christians there.

6. So Polycrates (the eight Bishop of Ephesus, borne within a while after Saint John's death) in his Epistle to Victor, Πολύκαρπος ὁ ἐν Σμύρνῃ καὶ ἐπίσκοπος καὶ μάρτυς, Polycarp the Bishop of Smyrna and Martyr.

7. So Irenæus, lib. 3. cap. 3. speaking of him, saith, καὶ ἰσθ' Ἀποστόλων ἀλυσάδης εἰς τὴν Ἀσίαν ἐν τῇ Σμύρνῃ ἐκκλησίᾳ Ἐπίσκοπος, that he was constituted by the Apostles Bishop of the Church of Smyrna in Asia.

8. And then what possibility can there be, that he being thus a Bishop, nay Metropolitane himselfe, (as hath formerly been shewed) writing to another Metropolis, and commanding to obey the Πρεσβύτεροι and Deacons, should meane any thing else but Bishops by Πρεσβύτεροι.

9. Thirdly, That this Polycarp, as in this Epistle he acknowledgeth to have received an Epistle from Ignatius (Ἐγὼ γὰρ μοι καὶ ὑμεῖς καὶ Ἰγνατίῳ, You wrote to me, and to Ignatius also) so he tells them that he had sent them a collection of the same Ignatius's Epistles. Τὰς ἐπιστολάς Ἰγνατίου πεμφθεῖσας ἡμῖν ἀπ' αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἄλλοις ὅσας ἔχουσι παρ' ἡμῖν, ἐπέμψαμεν ὑμῖν καθὼς ἐπέταξαδε, διδίνες ὑποτέλεισθαι ἐπὶ τῇ ἐπιστολῇ ταύτῃ, ἐξ ὧν μεγάλη ὀφελήσεται διωκόμενοι—The Epistles of Ignatius sent to us by him, and as many others as we had by us, we have sent to you, as you required, which are subjoynd to this Epistle, by which you may receive great benefit.

By this passage it is cleare, that as *Ignatius* wrote one *Epistle* to *Polycarpe*, another to the Church of *Smyrna*, where- of *Polycarpe* was *Bishop*, both contain'd under the phrase *πεμφθεῖς ἡμῖν*, sent to us, (as it is explain'd by *Eusebius* in these words, *Διὰ γραφῆς ὁμοίαι Ἰγνατίῳ τῇ Σμυρναίων ἐκκλησίᾳ*, id est: ὅτι τῷ ταύτης πατριάρχῳ Πολυκάρπῳ, *Ignatius* wrote to the Church of *Smyrna*, and severally to *Polycarpe* the Ruler thereof) so he wrote divers others also, which at that time, before *Ignatius's* death were by the *Philippians* desired from *Polycarpe*, and by *Polycarpe* transmitted to them, and so cannot with any sence be affirmed to be forged, and affix to his name after his death.

10.

How these *Epistles* were from *Polycarpe* brought down to the hands of *Irenæus*, who lived in *Polycarp's* time, and saw him an old man, and so testifies in his *Epistle* to *Florinus*, and cites a notable passage out of *Ignatius*, which we now have in his *Epistle* to the *Romans*: How, soone after *Irenæus*, * *Origen* cites them again, calling him *Martyr* and *Bishop* of *Antioch*, the second after *Peter*, and setting down the very words which we now have in the *Epistle* to the *Ephesians*; How, after *Origen*, † *Eusebius* sets down the whole story of writing them, together with a distinct Catalogue of seven, to *Ephesus*, to *Magnesia*, to the *Trallians*, to the *Romans*, to the *Philadelphians*, to the *Smyrneans*, and to *Polycarpe*: And in like manner *Athanasius*, citing from *Ignatius's* words which we now finde in his *Epistle* to the *Ephesians*, and *Theodore*t in many passages out of that to the *Ephesians*, to the *Trallians*, to the *Smyrneans*; And at last *St. Hierome* (on whose authority the *Presbyterians* so much depend) according exactly with *Eusebius*, to give these seven *Epistles* of *Ignatius* a full authority with all; All this I say hath been at large deduced and evidenced in the *Dissertations*; And this, one would thinke, might have been sufficient to have given *Ignatius* some place among their *Testimonies* for the opinion of antiquity in this matter, especially when that very *Epistle* of *Polycarpe*, which for the bare name of *Πρεσβύτεροι Elders* used by him, they cite, and give him his just honour, doth give testimony to the *Epistles* of *Ignatius*, as cleare, and

11.

* In Luc. Hom. 6.

† L. 3. c. 35. 36.

Catal. Script. & ad Helvid 6. 9.

Dissert. 2. c. 24.

as universally, and fully confirmed by others, as any, by which that Epistle of *Polycarpe* or *Clemens*, or any other antient writing stands in the *Church's*.

12.

But all this, it seemes, is of no weight with them, and therefore after the two testimonies of *Clemens*, and one of *Polycarpe*, backt with the like number of *three* more, a saying of *Bishop Bilson* (very unlikely to be to the *prejudice* of *Bishop*, if it were here seasonable to examine it) and the like of *Gratian*, and the third of the Lord *Digby*, They are then at leisure to remember what out of *Ignatius* is objected against them; Had he by any possible colour of any passage in him, been capable of doing them any service, he might then, as his Epistles were written before *Polycarps*, have also been called out and cited before him; But all those Epistles being so *diametrally* contrary to their pretensions, as every man knowes they are, he is now to be lookt on and answered, as *temptations* are wont to be, to be mentioned only, that he may be rejected by them.

Section III.

A vindication of Ignatius's Epistles, Voslius's edition of them, and the Archbishops of Armagh. Some Testimonies out of them. The cause of his so inculcating obedience to Bishops. Mr. Causabones Testimony considered, and the Allegations from the Archbishop of Armagh. Three Reasons against these Epistles answered. (No Marriage without the Bishop.) Of the Reformed Churches. Of the Church of Scotland after the first conversion.

Num. I.

Thus therefore they proceede, p. 107. Against all that hath beene said in this proposition, it is objected, that the blessed *St. Ignatius*, who lived in the first century, hath in his Epistles clearely and fully asserted *Episcopall Government*, as it is distinct from *Presbyteriall*, and that therefore there was no space of time, wherein the Church of Christ was governed by the common councill of *Presbyters* without *Bishops* properly so called.

I doe not conceive that they have said any thing of any
availe,

avails, for the proving their *Proposition*, and presume that neither from *Clement* nor *Polycarpe* it hath appeared that they have gained any thing; And therefore against all that they have said there is no need that I should make any *Objection*. But in a farre larger style I think it were no insolence to say, that against all that was ever imagined by any to be producible out of *Antiquity* in behalfe of *Presbytery*, the bare testimonies of this one *Apostolicall Martyr*, *Ignatius*, will be abundantly sufficient, being put in the other Scale, to weigh them all downe and decide the *controversie* on the *Prelatists* side.

It were here unreasonable at large to recite all these *testimonies*, being already set downe particularly *Dissert.* 2. c. 25. and the notoriety of the *fact* being such that a speciall *Objection* against the Epistles is, that he every where asserts *Episcopacy*. And therefore the onely way that could be invented for the supporting the *Presbyterians* interest against such direct *Testimonies*, so (every where) inculcated, and so impossible to be reconciled with their assertions, is this which they give us. p. 108. in these words.

In answer to this we must intreat the Reader to take notice that in the *Primitive Times* there were abundance of spacious and *suppositions* workes put forth under the Names of the *Apostles* and blessed *Martyrs*, which were none of theirs, &c. The like fraud hath been used in *Ignatius's* workes, &c.

Here first 'tis a little strange that the *spurious* and *suppositions* workes of the *Apostles* and *Martyrs* should be said to be put forth in the *Primitive Times*, unlesse that phrase *Primitive*, be taken in a very great *Latitude*, I had thought that it had been in *after times*, when errors were gotten in, and sought *patronage* and covert from the *Primitive Fathers*, that these *spurious* brats were borne, and affixt to great Names; And by this meanes indeed they are generally destroyed, by their *impudent* mentioning of some matters of *fact*, which fell out in those *latter-times*, and so discovered the *imposture*.

But this mistake importeth not much to our present *controversy*; If what is here confidently affirmed, [The like fraud

2.

3.

4.

5.

fraud was used in Ignatius's workes] can be any way proved to have truth in it, either in respect of the Primitive or after-times, I shall not quarrell upon such niceties. I shall therefore examine their proofes which follow.

6. And first, say they, it is certaine the Epistle of the blessed Virgin Mary to Ignatius, and of Ignatius to the blessed Virgin, and two other Epistles of Ignatius to John the Apostle are spurious and counterfeit.

7. To this I most willingly yeild, that the Epistles under Ignatius's name to the blessed Virgin and St. John may very probably be deemed none of his, and so they are generally rejected by those who mainteine ours, as well as their interests. I shall onely adde that there is no one word in them concerning Bishops, nor were they ever produced by any Prelatist in defence of them.

8. Next then, say they, As for his other twelve Epistles, five of them are by invincible arguments, as we conceive, proved by Vedelius to be written by a Pseudo-Ignatius. Eusebius and Hierome make mention but of seven.

9. Here also will easily be granted by us whatsoever is demanded; For though Vedelius a Divine of Geneva since the casting out of their Bishop and setting up of the new Government, might well be lookt on as a partiall arguer or Judge concerning Ignatius's writings, yet it being true, and by me formerly acknowledged that Eusebius and St. Hierome mention but seven Epistles of his, I shall also be ready to yeild to the utmost that Vedelius contended, that there be no more then seven Genuine Epistles of Ignatius, not that every of the other five can be proved to be suppositions, but because the antient testifications of the Church doe not make it so evident, that those other five are all his, as of the other seven they doe.

10. According to this concession it is, that in the Dissertations all the Testimonies which are produced in defence of Episcopacy, are taken out of those seven Epistles which St. Hierome, the Presbyter, and onely trusted friend of the Presbyterians, doth acknowledge to be his.

11. But of these seven also they have somewhat to say, in these words,

words: And for those seven, though with Scultetus, Vedelius and Rivetus we doe not renounce them as none of his, yet sure we are, they are so much adulterated and corrupted, that no man can ground any solid Assertion about Episcopacy from Ignatius's workes.

I hope I shall not now be lookt on, as an intemperate asserter of Episcopacy, if in this third step also I goe so farre with the Presbyterians as to yeld that I shall rest contented even, with those parcells of those seven Epistles, which these most rigid censors, even Vedelius himselve, which published him at Geneva, is content to acknowledge for his. If this be allowed me I shall need demand no more; The matter is evident, any man may consult Vedelius's edition, and finde testimonies as cleare for our turne, as could be wisht, in those parts of those Epistles which he allowes of.

But for the purging of Ignatius, as of all other Antients, I suppose the Method, which Vedelius used, proceeding for the most part, by his owne conjecture and phansie, is not likely to be the best; The one course which any Judicious Man would require or depend on, hath been used in this matter, since Vedelius had done his best; I meane the most antient copies in Europe have been consulted, and God's Providence hath been eminently discernable in the result of that inquiry.

Isaac Vossius, a knowne learned Man of that part of the Reformed Church, which is governed by Presbyters, hath met with an Antient Manuscript in the Medicean library, which hath none of the suspected Epistles, and is perfectly free from those passages, which were formerly among sober Men made matter of suspicion against the Epistles; And as in them we finde those very passages intire, which the Antients have cited out of them, so from them againe all the Testimonies are fetcht, which we desire to make use of in this matter.

So that if ever Ignatius wrote those Epistles which from Polycarpe downward the Antients generally agree that he wrote, I have no reason to feare or doubt but his authority, and the Testimonies I have brought from him, will be of full value and force in this matter.

12.

13.

14.

15.

16.

When this Copy out of the *Medicean Library* was first transcribed by *Vossius*, the greatest enemies of *Episcopacy* were much taken with it; *D. Blondel* confesses that he presently got a *Transcript* of it, compared it with the *Testimonies*, which the *Fathers* (*Polycarpe, Irenaus, Origen, Eusebius, Athanasius, Jerome, Chrysostome, &c.*) had cited out of *Ignatius*, and finding them all to agree with this copy, confesseth of himselfe that he was glad for this age of ours, that we had now gotten that very copy that 1300. yeares ago, *Eusebius* had used, and expected great light from thence. But at length this proved not for his turne, the *Author* spake so much of *Bishops* *ἀναίετος* *δυναίετος*, in season and out of season, that he set himselfe to form arguments against it, which are answer'd at large in the *Dissertations*.

17.

But beside this *Greeke* copy of *Vossius's* Edition, it fell out very opportunely, that the most Reverend *Archbishop* of *Armagh* about the same time met with some ancient *Latine* copies in *England*, which he thought fit to publish, although the *Translation* were rude and barbarous, and that *Latine* Edition of his was found every where agreeable to that *Greeke* of *Vossius*, freed, as that, from all interpolations, and by this concurrence of these *Providences*, there is all reason to think that we have at last the *Epistles* of *Ignatius*, as purely set out as either that of *Clemens*, or *Polycarpe*, or any other ancient writing.

18.

And in this purity it is that we now appeale to it, and have the three orders in the Church, *Bishops, Presbyters* and *Deacons*, and the Obedience and respect due to them, as evidently and irrefragably asserted in very many places, as any truth of *Scripture* can be expected to be.

19.

After all this, most distinctly deduced in the *Dissertations*, they yet proceed, we will not, say they, for our parts trouble the Reader with a large discourse about this subject. If he please he may read what the *Archbishop* of *Armagh*, what *River, Vedelius*, and *Cooke* in his *Censura Patrum*, and what *Salmasius* and *D. Blondel* say about it, who all of them bring divers arguments to evince the invalidity of these *Epistles*. There is a Doctor that hath undertaken to answer the Objections of the

the two last, But this Doctor should doe well to answer also what the Archbishop of Armagh, hath written about these Epistles, who proves at large that six of them are nothæ, the other six mixtæ, and none of them to be accounted omni ex parte sinceræ & genuinæ, who also tells us out of Calaubone, that among all the Ecclesiasticall Monuments there are none in which the Papists put more confidence, than in Ignatius's Epistles.

This being the summe of their charge on me in this place, that having answer'd all the Arguments of Blondell and Salmasius (I hope satisfactorily, or else they were very unkinde not to expresse their dislikes of some one answer) I have not yet answer'd the Arguments of the Archbishop of Armagh against these Epistles, I shall hope, that when either I have done that, or given competent reason, why I need not do it, I shall not need to travaile any farther in this Argument; yet to omit no paines which they can but thinke of prescribing me, I shall take the whole matter of this their last Section before me, and consider every part of it.

And 1. For River, Vedelius and Cooke in *Censura Patrum* 'tis evident, that their exceptions and censures belong to the former Printed Copies of Ignatius, that especially which had beene set out by Mastræus a Papist, against whom Vedelius his Edition and Exercitations were chiefly designed.

But then Vedelius having called this volume to a very strict examination, 'tis evident that that Copy, which he had thus purged, cannot be still lyable to his and the like exceptions, which before were made against the former Copies.

As for Salmasius and Blondell, their exceptions have, as is here confest, been already examined, and I need say no more of them till those answers be some way attempted to be invalidated, which here they are not, but instead of it, I am called to answer the Archbishop of Armagh his Arguments. Lastly, therefore for the Archbishop of Armagh; It is first somewhat unexpected, that what he had said, as the ground and occasion of making a new Edition, setting out this very ancient Copy, and by it purging Ignatius, who had before been

been so *corrupted* in his opinion, should now be proposed to me to be answered, who use that very *Copy*, which that *Arch-bishop* set out, and acknowledge it was formerly as *corruptly* set forth, as he conceived it to be.

24. Is it not visible that the *Archbishop's* whole designe in two impressions of those Epistles, was to set them out free from all corruptions and mixtures, and interpolations, which they had before been under : And that all his discourses in his *Prolegomena*, were to prove the former editions to have been *corrupt*, and so that there was great need of seeking out better Copies, and that he verily thought he had now found such ? And then what can be required of me to answer in his writings, who am directly of his opinion in all the *substantiall* parts of the whole matter ?

25. As for *lesser* doubts, as whether that one to *Polycarpe* be among the *genuine* or no, though with *Eusebius* and *St. Hierome* I believe it is, and have given the reasons of my opinion, yet I need not *controvers* this with any, because the other *six* will still serve my turne abundantly, and the *Testimonies* out of the most purged *Geneva*, or *Amstelodam*-editions of those *six*, will sufficiently vindicate *Episcopacy* in our present notion of it to be then received, and of the *Apostles* erecting in the *Church*.

26. A few of these *Testimonies* I shall here set downe *πρὸς δύνειν*, that the Reader may know the *unquestionable* opinion of *Ignatius*, and how farre I am from necessity of using any *corrupted copy* of those Epistles. First, then in his Epistle to the *Smyrnaens*, we have the three Orders set down distinctly, *ἐπισκόπου, πρεσβυτέρου, διακόνου*, and againe *ἀντιλόγος τὸν ἐξιδίον ἐπισκοπὸν καὶ βοηθὸν πρεσβυτέρου, καὶ τὸν συνδύακον μὲν διακόνου*, the like in 3 places to the *Ephesians*, in 3. to the *Magnesians*, in 4. to the *Philadelphians*, in 4. to the *Trallians*. So secondly we have their particular *Bishops* mentioned, as such, *Polycarpe* of *Smyrna*, in the Epistle to the *Magnesians*, *Onesimus* of *Ephesus* in his congratulation to the *Ephesians*, *τοῦτον ἐπίσκοπον κληῖναι*, that they had such a *Bishop*, adding *Burrhus* his *Deacon* : *Damas* of the *Magnesians*, together with the names of two of their *Presbyters*,
Bassus

*Bassus and Apollonius, and Sotion the Deacon, all in the Epistle to the Magnesians. Polybins of the Trallians, in the Epistle to them. Thirdly we have his affirmation concerning Bishops through the whole World, that they are constituted as, or by the minde of Christ, i. e. sent by him, as he by his Father, 'Inoēs xεις δὲ πατὲρ * γνῶμῃ, ὡς ὃς ἐπισκοποι * Perhaps γνῶμῃ in both places. κατὰ τὰ πνεύματα ἀειδύς 'Ιησοῦ χεῖρ γνῶμῃ εἰσι. Jesus Christ is the mind or by, or according to the mind of the Father (sent and Commissionated by him to reveale his will to us) and so the Bishops constituted through the World are the minde, or by the minde of Christ. Fourthly, he tells us that all in the Church, particularly Presbyters, must yeild obedience to the Bishop, Πάντες ἐπισκόπων ἀκολουθεῖτε, all follow the Bishop, in the Epistle to the Smyrnaeans, ἵνα ὑποτασσώμεθα τῷ ἐπισκόπῳ κατὰ πάντα, ὅτε ἡγιασώμεθα, that being subjeēt to the Bishop yee may be sanctified in all things, in Ep. ad. Eph. πρέπει πᾶσαν ἐν τειπλῷ τῷ ἐπισκόπῳ σπονόμεν, yee ought to pay all reverence to the Bishop, adding, καθὼς ἔγνω ὃς τὸς ἁγίους πρεσβυτέρους, as he had observed their pious Presbyters to doe, though their Bishop were yong in Ep. ad Magnes: and againe, ὑποτάγῃτε τῷ ἐπισκόπῳ, be subjeēt to the Bishop, so τῷ ἐπισκόπῳ πρεσέχετε give heed to the Bishop, in Ep. ad Philad. τῷ ἐπισκόπῳ ὑποτάσσεται, & ἀναγκάσιον ἐστὶ τῷ ἐπισκόπῳ ὑποτάσσεται, be subjeēt, and it is necessary to be subjeēt to the Bishop, and Ἐπεὶ οὖν ὑποτασσώμεθα τῷ ἐπισκόπῳ. Farewell yee that obey the Bishop, in Ep. ad Trall. Fifthly, he oft addes, that nothing ought to be done in the Church without licence of the Bishop, Μηδεὶς χωρὶς τοῦ ἐπισκόπου τι πράξῃ τῶν ἀνηκόντων εἰς τὴν ἐκκλησίαν, Let none without the Bishop doe any of the things that belong to the Church, instanting in Baptisme and the other Sacrament, in Ep. ad Smyr. and so in the Epistles to the Philadelphians and Trallians. Sixthly, that a convenient reverence and respectt is also due to the Presbyters, and, to the Deacons, as is every where taken notice of by him, almost in every Epistle.*

And all this and much more we have in the Copies, which are now come, most uncorrupt, unto us, And there is no imaginable way to avoid the force of these Testimonies, and the

27.

the authority of that holy *Martyr* for *Episcopacie*, but the *unalitura*, expunging or casting away the whole volume of *Epistles*.

28. For the truth is, his whole designe, before his departure from the world, being this one of *divine* Charity, to fortifie the severall *flocks*, to which he wrote, against the poyson of *Hereticks*, the *Gnosticks*, so early creeping in, and despising the *Governors* of the *Church*, (as they had done the *Apostles* themselves) and the *Doctrine* of the *Apostles* being by him knowne to be deposited with the *Bishops* in each *Church*, and having particular assurance of the *sanctity*, and sound *faith* of the present *Governors* of these *Churches*, to which he writes, He thinks fit to make use of this one most *compendious* course, most immediately tending to his end, to keep them all in obedience to their *Bishops* and *officers* under them, and to make the contrary (as it was indeed) the sure marke of *Heresicks*, whom they were to avoid.

29. And so this is it which hath so fill'd all the *Epistles* (except that one to the *Romanes*) with continuall discourse of the *Bishops*, &c. And it is evident that in that present *conjunction* of affaires, nothing could with more reason and fittest have been insisted on.

30. Meane while that I may returne to the place from which I have a while *diverted*, It is so certaine and evident of the learned *Archbishop* of *Armagh*, that he never disputed against the *validity* and *authority* of these *Epistles* thus purged, that it cannot be unknowne to them that thus dispute, what *arguments* he hath urged for the *authority* of them, and in like manner what and how satisfactory *answers* he hath given to the speciall exceptions of others, which very thing occasioned a particular *letter* of *reply* to him from D. *Blondel*, which by that *Archbishops* favour I received, and made my rejoinder to it in the * *Dissertations*.

* Diss. 1 c. 9.
Sec 6 &c.

31. This I hope may be sufficient to have said in this matter, instead of undertaking so unreasonable a taske of *answering* any thing asserted by that *Archbishop*.

32. As for that which follows out of him and M. *Casaubone* of *Baronius* and the *Papists* making such use, and placing such con-

confidence in these *Epistles* above all other *Ecclesiasticall Monuments*. It is speedily answered also out of what is already said, that they were the former corrupt editions, which were abroad in *Baronius's* time, with all those *supposititious additions & interpolations*, which the *Papists* are either by *Mr. Casaubone*, or that *Archbishop* said to have made use of; there being no one word or period in this *volume*, to which my appeal is made, which yeildeth any advantage to the *Papists* in any point, nor is it, nor can it be pretended by any that it doth, unlesse by those in whose opinion the mainteining of *Bishops* is reputed for such. And therefore that very learned man, *M. Casaubone*, is so far from rejecting all these *Epistles*, that he distinctly promisseth nonnullarum ex illis antiquitatem se novis rationibus tuenturum, that he will, if God permit, defend the antiquity of some of them, by reasons which others had not taken notice of: *Exerc. 16. Cont. Baron. Sect. 150.* And this promise of his is cited by the *Archbishop*, *Dissert. de Epist. Ign. pag. 136.* so farre is it from all appearance of truth, which is cited as the opinion of these two learned men.

After all this, three Reasons they will briefly offer, why they cannot build their judgement concerning the Doctrine of the Primitive Church, about Episcopacy upon *Ignatius's Epistles*.

33.

1. Because there are divers things quoted out of his *Epistles* by *Athanasius*, *Gelasius*, and *Theodoret*, which are either not to be found in these *Epistles*, or to be found altered and changed, and not according as they are quoted. This is *Ruvet's* argument, and pursued at large by the *Archbishop*, to whom we referre the Reader.

Being among their other Readers referr'd to the *Archbishop* of *Armagh* for the validity and pursuit of this first reason, I shall to him very securely make my appeal, what force there is in it, against the *volume* of *Epistles* now twice in severall formes published by him. And in the *Prolegomena* to the former of them, *pag. 15, 16. &c.* this is most evident that the passages cited by *Athanasius*, *Gelasius*, and *Theodoret*, which were not indeed to be found in the former printed *Greek* copies, are exactly discerned and evidenced by him to be in the old *latine Interpreter*, which he therefore thought fit to publish.

34.

lish both out of *Cains College* and *Bishop Montacute's Library*. The same hath he farther shewn, cap 4. pag. 19. &c. out of the same and other of the *Antients*, *Eusebius*, *Hierome*, &c. and set downe the places in *columnes*, by way of *parallel*, to demonstrate the agreement of this *Copy* with the genuine *Ignatius*.

35. And is it not a little strange, that I should be now referred to that *Archbishop* for the pursuit of this argument, which he hath so distinctly proved to be of no force against the *Copy* which now I use, but to concur in demonstrating the purity of it?
36. Their second Reason they draw from his over-much extolling himselfe in his *Epistle* to the *Trallians*, where he saith that he had attained to such a measure of knowledge, that he understood heavenly things, the orders of *Angels*, the differences of *Archangels*, and of the heavenly host, the differences between powers and dominations, the distances of thrones and powers, the *Magnificencies* or *Magnitudes* of *Eones* or *Principalities*, the sublimity of the *Spirit*, the excellencies of *Cherubims* and *Seraphims*, the Kingdoms of the Lord, and the incomparable Divinity of the Lord God almighty. All these things I know, and yet am not perfect, &c. Now who is there that can believe that such arrogant boasting can proceed from such an holy man, and humble Saint, as *Ignatius* was?
37. And who would believe that the writer of this *Appendix*, which had cited the *Archbishop* of *Armagh* in his *Prologomena* to his first Edition of *Ignatius*, and so could not but be able to have consulted that Edition, should thus thinke to defame, and blast the whole volume of *Epistles*, for one such periods sake, which is not to be discerned in this, or that *Archbishops* latter, or in *Vossius's* edition of them, to which onely he must know we make our appeal for *Episcopacy*?
38. In these Copies the words are quite distant from what is here cited, and in effect, directly contrary to them, evidences of the greatest humility, now when he was so neer the honor of *Martyrdom*, καὶ γὰρ ἐγὼ ἡ καθότι δίδεμαι καὶ δωδέκα τὰ ἐπιστολάκια, καὶ τὰς τοποθεσίας τὰς ἀγγελικάς, καὶ τὰς οὐράσιαις τὰς ἀρχοντικάς, ὁρᾶτε καὶ ἀόρατα, περὶ τὸ τοῦ ἡσίου καὶ μαθητὸς ἔμμε, For

I am not, because (or in that) I am in bonds able also to understand heavenly things, the Positions of Angells, their assemblies of Principalities (or of the Rulers of them) both things visible and invisible. Besides this, I am yet also a Disciple, &c. What arrogance, I pray, or boasting is there in this? and yet he addes no more in that place but onely, πολλά γὰρ ὑμῖν λείπει, ἵνα θεῷ μὴ λειπώμεθα, For many things are wanting to us that we may not be left behinde by God, thinking himselfe utterly unworthy of the honour (and fearing he may yet misse of it) to suffer Martyrdome for him. And so much for the second Reason.

The third (which, say they, is most for our purpose) is from his over-eager and over-anxious defence of the Episcopal Hierarchy, which he doth with such strange and Hyperbolical expressions (as if all Christianity were lost, if Prelacie were not upheld) and with such multiplied repetitions ad nauseam usque, that we may confidently say as one doth, Certo certius est has Epistolas vel supposititias esse, vel scede corruptas, and that they doe neither agree with those times wherein he wrote, nor with such an holy and humble Martyr as he was. We will instance in some few of them.

39.
Ceci censura.

What reasons and designe Ignatius had to exhort the Christians, to whom he writes to obedience to their Governors, in the Church, hath already been said at large, this being the onely expedient, that, at that time, could be thought on, to keep out most dangerous heresies out of the Church. And therefore what that holy Martyr did in that kind, when he was carryed from his owne Church, never to returne to it againe, cannot be lookt on, as the seeking any great things for himselfe, and so contrary to either his piety or humility, but as a desire full of both those, that the Church of God might enjoy truth and peace, after the beasts had devoured him.

40.

As for the strange and hyperbolical expressions, mentioned in the objection, and exemplified in the two following pages, the Reader must againe be told, that what they had done most unreasonably before, is here practised againe at large, severall places brought out of the former corrupt editions of Ignatius, of which no one word is to be found in the new editions out of

41.

the most ancient Copies Greek and Latine, from which alone it is evident that we produce all our testimonies for *Episcopacy*, and so have produced very few of those, which they are thus pleased to finde fault with.

42.

The places which they urge, are eight, I shall not need to set them down, but give the Reader a much shorter, and yet as satisfactory an account of them. Two are cited from the *Epistle* to the *Thracians*, and neither of them are in any part to be found in our Editions. Two are cited from the *Epistle* to the *Magnesians*, and the first is not at all in our Editions, nor the second any farther than thus, ὡς περ ὁ ἐν Κλειᾷ ἀνὸς τοῦ πατρὸς ἑδὼν ἐν τοῖς αἰσιν τοῦ υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ, ὅτι δι' αὐτοῦ, ὅτι δι' Ἀποστόλων, ἕως μὴδε ὑμεῖς ἀνὸς τοῦ ὁπτατοῦ καὶ ἡ πρεσβυτέρων μὴδὲν πράττει, μὴδὲ πρεσβυτέρους ἐνυχοῦν τι ποιεῖναι ἰδίᾳ ὑμῶν. As Christ being one with his Father did nothing without him, either by himselfe or by his Apostles, so neither do ye act any thing without the Bishop and the Presbyters, nor endeavour that any thing should appeare reasonable to you which is private, or of your owne devising. A speech in every syllable of it, very well becoming that Holy Martyr, written by him at a time, when the truth being by the Apostles deposited with the Bishops, all private devises of their owne were most justly to be suspected.

43.

The first is in the *Epistle* to Polycarpe, and is in our Copies thus, Πέπειθ' τοῖς γαμοῖς καὶ τοῖς γαμυμέναις καὶ γυναικὶς τοῦ ὁπτατοῦ τῶν ἐν ὡσιν ποιεῖν. It becomes the men that marry, and the women that are married, to consummate their union with the consent of the Bishop. And I wonder what age of the Church there hath been from that time to this, which hath not been of the same opinion. For what is by Bishops committed to Presbyters, that is not done ἀνὰ γυναικὶς ὁπτατοῦ, without the mind of the Bishop (as elsewhere in those *Epistles* appeares of Baptisme and the Lords Supper, neither of which, saith he, are to be meddled with without the consent of the Bishop, and many testimonies out of Antiquity are * elsewhere produced in perfect conformity therewith.) And consequently, if in the Christian Church, marriage hath alwayes been consummated by the Priest or Presbyter, then cannot this speech of Ignatius have any blame in it. And

* See Nam. 55.

And that thus it hath been through all ages, there is little matter of *question* (and no word here produced by the *Objectors* to the contrary) * *Tertullian* will be a good competent *Ad Uxor. l. a. c. ult.* *testimonie* for the next *Centurie*, speaking of the *felicity* of the *Christian Marriage*, *quod Ecclesia conciliat, & confirmat oblatio, & obsequat benedictio, Angeli renuntiant, &c.* Which the Church makes, the Sacrament of the Lords Supper confirms, the benediction of the Priest Seales, and the Angels pronounce valid. And in * another place, *Poenas nos occultae conjunctiones, i. e. non prius apud Ecclesiam professas, iuxta moechiam & fornicationem judicari periclitantur, Marriages that are not done publicly before the Church, are in danger with us, to goe for adultery and fornication.* *De Pudic. c. 4.*

44.

The same is every where to be found in the *Decretal Epistles* of *Evaristus*, about *Ignatius's* time (which makes it a tradition from the *Apostles* and their *successors*) of *Soter* not above 50 yeares after, of *Callistus* neer fifty yeares after him, of *Silvester* an 100 yeares after him, of *Siricius* 70. yeares after *Silvester*, of *Hormisdas* 130. yeares after *Siricius*: And though some of these be by *D. Blandel* thought to be of later dates than the titles of them would pretend, yet the authority of most of them is unquestioned, as to this matter.

45.

And the *antient* piece lately publisht by *Sirmund* concerning the *Hereſe* of the *Predestinati*, written, saith he, 1200. yeares since, speaks of it, as a *knowne custome* and *Canon* of the Church, over all the world, For, saith that *antient author*, *If marriage be unlawfull, Emendate ergo Ecclesia regulam, damnate qui in toto orbe sunt, sacerdotes, Nuptiarum initia benedicentes, consecrantes, & in Dei mysteriis sociantes, Amend then the rule the of Church, and condemne th. Priests Which are in all the world. who bless the beginnings of Marriage, consecrate, and joyne the parties together with the Holy Sacraments.*

46.

And the fourth *Council* of *Carthage*, before the yeare 400. hath these words, *Sponsus & Sponsa cum benedicendi sunt à sacerdote—When the Bridegroom and the Bride are to be blest by the Priest, Can. 13.* And for latter ages the matter is out of *Question*.

47.

48. And so it will be much more *reasonable*, from this passage in *Ignatius*, being found so perfectly concordant with other passages of the times to neer him, to resolve the *rule* of the Church concerning *sacerdotal benediction* in marriage to be received from the *Apostles* and their *successors*, than from finding this speech in one of *Ignatius's Epistles*, to cast away the whole *volume*.
49. As for that which is added at the end of this *testimony* from the *Epistle to Polycarpe*, *My soule for theirs, that obey the Bishop, Presbyters and Deacons*, there can be no fault in that, supposing as hath been said, that the *Bishops* at that time, & the *Presbyters & Deacons* living regularly and in *union* with them, had the *true* safe way among them, wherein any man might walke *confidently*, all danger being from the *Heresies* that crept in, and brake men off from that *unity* of the *faith*.
50. The *sixth* place from the *Epistle to the Philadelphians*, of the *Princes and Emperors* obeying the *Bishop*, is certainly inserted by forgery in the *former*, for not one word of it, or like it, is to be found in our *editions*.
51. So likewise for both parts of the *seventh* place out of the *Epistle to the Smyrnaeans*, they are not to be found in our *editions*.
52. The *last* onely is to be met with there, but that in a much more *moderate* straine, than the *former*, in *words* and *sense* very agreeable to *wholsome doctrine*, and the *exigencies* of those times, wherein there was no *visible* way to keep out the *rares* of *false teachers*, but by requiring all to be kept to the *managery* of the true *husbandman*. And accordingly I have cited this very speech out of *Ignatius* for the asserting of *Prelacie* (and if there were no such, the *Epistles* might passe well enough with these, as with all other men, they would have needed no *vindication*, having no *adversary*) The words are these, Πάυλις τῷ ἐπισκότῳ ἀκολουθεῖτε, ὡς Ἰησοῦ Χριστῷ τῷ πατρὶ, καὶ τῷ πρεσβυτέρῳ ὡς τοῖς ἀποστόλοις, τὰς ὁ διακόνους ἀκολουθεῖτε ὡς δὲ ἐπισκότῳ — All of you follow the Bishop as Christ Jesus did his Father (i. e. as elsewhere appears by the like exprellion, with [ὡς ὁ πατήρ] added to it, be at perfect *unity* or *doctrine*, &c. with

with the *Bishop*, as *Christ* was with *God the Father*) and the *Presbytery* as the *Apostles*, and reverence the *Deacons* as those that are appointed by *God*, (viz. mediately by the *Apostles*).

Where it may be observable, that the objectors which find such fault with this speech of *Ignatius* in their quarrelling with it, leave out this latter part of *Presbytery* and *Deacons*; they cannot finde in their hearts to quarrell, or accuse him for bidding them follow the *Presbytery* as the *Apostles*, the onely crime was to bid them follow the *Bishop* (not, as *Christ* in the dative, i.e. as they follow *Christ*, but) as *Christ* follows his *Father*, the onely piacular offence, to recommend unity with, and obedience to the *Bishop*. But that by the way.

53.

It followes in the place, Μὴ εἰς χεῖρας ἀνθρώπου τὸ πρεσβυτεῖον, Let no Man without the *Bishop* doe ought which belongs to the Church, Let that be accounted a firme *Eucharist*, which is done by the *Bishop*; or him whom the *Bishop* shall permit. Where the *Bishop* appeares there let the multitude be, as where *Christ* is, there is the *Catholick Church*, It is not lawfull without the *Bishop* (i.e. as before, without commission from him) either to Baptize or Administer the *Eucharist*, but what he approves of (thus in these publick Ministrations) that is well pleasing to *God*, that it may be safe and firme whatsoever is done; It doth well that men know *God* and the *Bishop* (as their Ruler under *God*, with whom his truth is by the *Apostles* deposited) he that honours the *Bishop*, is honoured by *God*, he that doth any thing clancularly without him, serves the *Devill* (performes a very acceptable service to him; For so in a very eminent manner the Hereticks of that age, the *Gnosticks* did, which secretly infused their devils Leaven, and deadly poison into mens hearts, by which they took them quite from *Christ*, but could not have done so successfullly, if this *Holy Martyr's* counsell here had been taken)

54.

What inconvenience can be imagined consequent to our affirming that *Ignatius* was the author of these words, I confess not to comprehend; Of this there is no question, but

55.

that it is the ordinary *Language* of the *ancient Church*, and accounted necessary in an *eminent degree*, to preserve *unity and truth* in the *Church*, and to hold up the *authority* of *Governours* among all, οἱ πρεσβύτεροι καὶ διάκονοι ἀνεὺ γνώμης ἐπισκόπου μὴδὲν ἐπιτελεῖσθαι, *The Presbyters and Deacons must doe nothing without the minde of the Bishop*, *Can. Apost. 40.* and the reason is added αὐτὸς γὰρ ὁ πιστευόμενος τὸν λαὸν ὡς κυρίῳ, *for he is intrusted with the people of the Lord*, So in the 56. *Canon of Laodicea*, τὰς πρεσβυτέρους μὴδὲν πρῶτον ἀνεὺ γνώμης ὡς ἐπισκόπου, *The Presbyters must doe nothing without the minde of the Bishop*, and so in the *Concill of Arles*, *Can. 19.* *The Presbyters must doe nothing in any Diocesse sine Episcopi sententia, without the Bishops minde, and sine autoritate literarum ejus, without authority of his Letters.*

56. All that is here offer'd by them to make the like words in *Ignatius* a competent charge, upon which to throw away the whole volume of *Epistles*, is onely this, *If this be true Doctrine, what shall become of all the Reformed Churches, especially the Church of Scotland, which (as John Major saith lib. 2. Histor. de Gestis Scotorum, c. 2.) was after it's first conversion to the Christian faith above 230. yeares without Episcopall Government.*

57. To this double question I might well be allowed to render no answer, It being certainly very extrinsecall to the *Question* in hand, (which is onely this, whether *Ignatius* wrote or wrote not those *Epistles*) to examine what shall become of the *Reformed Churches*, &c. It were much more reasonable for mee to demand of the *Objectors*, who suppose their *Presbyteriall platforme*, as that is opposed to *Episcopall*, to be settled in the *Church* by *Divine Right*, If this *Doctrine* be true, what did become of all those *Primitive Churches* all the *World* over, which they confesse departed from this modell, and set up the *contrary*, and so of all the succeeding ages of the *Church* for so many 100 yeares, till the *Reformation*, and since that also, of all the other *Churches*, which doe not thus farre imitate *Mr. Calvin*, casting out the *Government* by *Bishops*?

Is it not as reasonable that they should be required to give a faire and justifiable account of their dealing with (and judging, *post factum*, of) all these, as I should be obliged to reconcile Ignatius his speech concerning his present age, with the *conveniencies* of the Reformed Churches, which he could neither see, nor be deemed to speak of, nor consequently to passe judgement on them by *divination*.

58.

What they were guilty of which secretly infused their *poysen* into Men and Women in his age, and would not let the Bishop the Governour of the Church, be the Judge of their *Doctrines* and *practises*, he here tells us, *viz.* That they performed service to the Devill, in stealing Mens hearts from Christ; But what crime it was in those of Corinth, and through all Achaia, to turne their Bishops out of their places, *ἐκβάλλειν ἐπισκοπῆς* and *λειτουργίας*, to cast them out of their Episcopacy their Office and Ministracion, this he tells them not in that place, Clemens Romanus had done it competently in his Epistle.

59.

As for the *particular* case of those Reformed Churches, which have done more then so, not onely cast out their present Governours, but over and above utterly cast off the Government it selfe, there had been I confesse, a great deale said, both in this and other places of Ignatius, and many other Antient Writers, who yet never foretold these dayes, abundantly sufficient to have restrained them from so disorderly proceedings, if they would have pleased to have hearkned to such moderate counsells. But having not done so, Ignatius hath gone no farther, he is only a witnesse against them, he undertooke not the Office of a judge so farre beyond his Province, hath pronounced no sentence upon them.

60.

And to proceed one degree farther, to the successors of those in the Reformed Churches (as many as are justly blameable for treading in their Leaders steps) though I may truly say, they have as little taken that Holy Martyrs advise, and more than so, that they have retained a considerable corruption in their Churches, and that they should doe well, if now they know how, to restore themselves to that model, which they find every where exemplified in Ignatius, yet till they shall

61.

shall have done so, I know that they are *exactly* capable of being concern'd in any part of these words, last cited from *Ignatius*.

62. For they that have no *Bishop* at all, cannot be required to *doe nothing without consulting with the Bishop*; They are justly to be *blamed*, as farre as they are guilty, that they have no *Bishop*; but then that is their *crime* (and they are to reforme it as soone as they please) but that being supposed, this of not *consulting the Bishop*, while they have *none*, is no *new crime*, nor liable of it selfe to the *censure* of *ἡ ἀρχιεπισκοπή* here, which was affixt to those that had *Bishops*, and would not have their *Doctrines* examined by that *standard*, of which they were the *Depositaries*. And this is as much as is needfull to be said in this place for that first *inconvenience* affixt to *Ignatius's* words.

63. As for the other, the *Church of Scotland* in it's first *conversion*, the matter againe is so remote from the taske we have now in hand, for the vindicating the *Authority* of *Ignatius's* *volume* of *Epistles*, and withall so *uncertainly* set downe by *Authors*, that it would be *unseasonable* to engage farre in so *darke* a part of *History* so impertinently. In briefe therefore, though I have not *John Major* by me to consult, yet I conceive I shall not guesse amisse at the grounds, and consequently at the truth and weight of his assertion.

64. *Joannes Jordanus* was of opinion that **Paschasius* a *Sicilian* *prima Christiana pietatis rudimenta mandante P. Victore in Scotia nuntiavit*, first preacht the *Christian Faith* in *Scotland* by the command of *Pope Victor*. And this was about the year 203. And † *Bede* saith that in the eight yeare of *Theodosius Junior*, that is about the yeare 431, *Palladius ad Scotos in Christum credentes à Pontifice Romana Ecclesia Cælestino primus mittitur Episcopus*, *Palladius* was by *Celestine Bishop* of *Rome* sent first *Bishop* to the *Scots* that believed. And the distance betwixt these two termes being 228. yeares, this I conceive the ground-work of *John Major's* affirmation here cited, of the 230. yeares, wherein that *Church* after it's first *conversion* remained without *Episcopall Government*.

But

But first it is to be noted here, that the saying of *Jordanus* of *Paschasius* in *Victor's* day-s, is no more than this, that he preached the Gospel there, *prima rudimenta nuntiavit*, declared the first rudiments there, and, as it followes in *Demster*, *tyrocinia fidei fecit*, laid the grounds of Christianity among them; And that might be done, and soone moulder away againe, and never come to so much maturity, as either to have *Bishops* or *Presbyters* constituted among them. And secondly, though *Bede* say that *Palladius* was sent to them *Episcopus primus*, their first Bishop, yet neither he, nor any other affirms that they were formerly ruled by a *Presbytery*, or so much as that they had any *Presbyter* among them. Nay thirdly, *Demster* reports it from *Jordanus* but slightly, *Job. Jordanus putavit*; it was the conceit or opinion of that author. And that which * *Bozins* tells us will take off much from the creditableness of that Opinion, Traditur in *Scotiâ*, quæ tunc erat *Hibernia*, Christi cultum disseminatum eodem tempore quo in *Britanniâ*, sub annum Christi 203. *Victore* sedente. They say that the faith of Christ was disseminated in Scotland, which was then Ireland, at the same time that it was in Britanny, about the yeare 203. in the time of *Victors* Papacy.

65.

* Lib 8. de signis
Ecc. 6. 1.

By this it appeares that the conceit of *Jordanus* belonged to Ireland, not to Scotland, Ireland being antiently called *Scotia* (as in † *Bede* we finde, *Scotorum qui Hiberniam insulam Britannia proximam incolunt*, the Scots which inhabit Ireland, and * *Gentes Scotorum qua Australibus Hibernia partibus morabantur*, the Scots which inhabited the Southerne parts of Ireland) and that which is now Scotland, was then styled *Nova Scotia*, to distinguish it from the other. And it is worth remembring that *Marianus* the Scotch Antiquary had no knowledge of this conversion of Scotland under *Victor*, nor is there any shew of it in *Bede*, who tells us of the latter.

66.

† Li 2. c. 4.

* L. 3. c. c.

† See Baron.
Annal. Tom. 5.
Anno. 429.
Scot. 2.

Nay it is yet more evident * by *Prosper*, that 'twas a conversion from barbarous to Christian, which is spokon of in *Cælestines* time, and that the Faith was planted, and the Bishop constituted there together, *Venerabilis memoria Pontifex*

67.

* Adv. Cellar.
in fine.

*rixef ab hoc eodem morbo Britannias liberavit, & ordinato Scottis Epifcopo, dum Romanam infulam studet fervare, Catholicam fecit etiam barbaram Christianam, Pope Cæleftine freed Britaine from Pelagianifme, and ordained a Bifhop for the Scots, and fo while he indeavoured to keepe a Romane Ifland within the bounds of the Catholick Faith, he alfo made a barbarous Ifland Christian. Which as it differs fomewhat from Bedes expreffion of Palladius's being ſent ad credentes, to believers, ſo it gives us occaſion to propoſe that which may reconcile theſe ſeeming differences, viz. 1. That Chriſtianiſm was planted in Scotland before Cæleftine's time, derived to them molt probably from their Neighbours the Britaines here, with whom they are * known to have agreed in the keeping of Eaſter, contrary to the cuſtome of the Romane Church, and ſo cannot be deemed to have received the firſt Rudiments of their converſion from Rome: Then ſecondly that this Plantation was very imperfett, differing little from Barbariſme, and ſo reputed by Proſper, till the coming of Biſhop Palladius among them. Thirdly, that even after that, they retain'd the uſage of Eaſter, contrary to the Romane cuſtome, which ſtill referres to ſome rude converſion of theirs before Palladius.*

* See Bede l. 2. c. 4. Scotos nihil diſcrepare à Britonibus in eorum converſatione diſcimus, and c. 9. & l. 3. c. 3. Hoc enim ordine ſeptentrigonalis ſcotorum Provincia & omnes natio Picte ſ. Pajſaba Dominicum celebrabat.

68.

By all this it is cleared to us, what is to be thought of John Major's affirmation, which hath now very little appearance of truth in it, and if it had, would be little for the Presbyterian intereſt to inſiſt on it, when after all that time of the ſuppoſed government of that Church by Presbyters, it was found directly barbarous, and to be planted with Chriſtianiſm anew, at Palladius's coming.

69.

Some uncertainty we ſee there is of the time and meanes of planting Chriſtianiſm in Scotland, but as to this matter of the 230. yeares under Presbytery, there can be no ground to affirme it; For if the converſion of it be dated from Viſtor's time, as that opinion would have it, yet even by that account 'twas after the ſpace, wherein the Presbyterians themſelves acknowledge Episcopacy to have prevailed over all the World; and then, upon that account, it muſt be granted, that whenſoever their firſt converſion was, 'twas certainly derived to them.

them by those who had *Episcopall Government* among them, and then they having sent them *Presbyters* to instruct and officiate (as *Presbyters* not as *Bishops*) among them, those *Presbyters* must be supposed to have continued under those *Bishops* by whom they were sent, whether from *Rome*, or neerer home from the *British*, so farre at least, as that when they failed, their number was supplied from the same *Fountaine* from which they first sprang, (in the same manner as our own experience tells us of *Virginia*, which since the first *Plantation* continued to receive *Presbyters* from hence) and so continued to be, untill they had *Bishops* ordained and planted among them. And so much for that second supposed inconvenience also.

Sect. I V.

Of Salmasius's conceit that these Epistles were written at the time of Episcopacy first entring the Church.

THAT which followes of the Justice of the Reverend Presbyterian Divines censure of these Epistles, & of Salmasius's Num. 1. his beliefe, that they were written by a *Pseudo-Ignatius*, will not require any answer from me, who cannot be moved by the conclusion made by those Divines, any farther than the Premises here produced and answered, have appeared to have force in them, and who have more largely examined Salmasius his exceptions heretofore, and was even now by them acknowledged so to have done, and nothing yet replied to my answers, and therefore must not for ever turne the same stone, begin the same task againe.

But for the conceit which is here cited from Salmasius, which I confesse I considered not so much before, as to make any reply to it, viz. That these Epistles were written when Episcopacy, properly so called, came into the Church, and that proved from hence, because in all his Epistles he speaks highly in honour of Presbytery as well as of Episcopacy, that so the people, that had been accustomed to the Presbyterian Government, might the more willingly and easily receive this new

Government by Episcopacy, and not be offended at the novelty of it. It is evident how easily this may be retorted, and the argument as firmly formed to conclude, that *Presbyters* were then newly come into the Church, and therefore to make the people inclinable to give them a willing Reception, without being offended at the novelty of them, he still speaks highly in honour of *Episcopacy*.

3. Such Arguments as these you will guesse from hence, how incompetent they are to conclude matters of fact, done so many hundred yeares agoe, (such is the question, whether *Ignatius* wrote these Epistles or no) It is much more probable that they wanted Arguments of any real validity, who are faine to fly to such Succors as these.
4. Yet one farther misadventure there is, in forming or making use of this conceit, For what is said in those Epistles concerning the honour due to *Presbyters* or the *Presbytery*, is farre from looking favourably on the *Presbyterian Government*, for certainly as long as there is a *Bishop*, properly so called, set over the *Presbyters*, as they know there is in all those Epistles, and as long as the *Presbyters* are to do nothing without commission from him (as they knew also (and even now quarrell'd at it) that by him they are required to doe) there is little shew of the *Presbyterian* model discernible, no whit more, than there was in England long before they covenanted to cast the *Bishops* out of the Church, It being certaine that no community or equality of *Presbyters* taken into counsell with the *Bishop*, doth constitute the *Government Presbyterian*, as long as there be any *Bishops* to have power over *Presbyters*; Else had the Convocation of *Deanes*, *Archdeacons* and *Clerke*, fourteen yeares agoe, been the platform of *Presbyterian Government* in England.
5. This is, I conceive, a full answer to every the most minute part or appearance of Argument here produced against these Epistles, and is all that was proper here to be said concerning *Ignatius*, whose Epistles as long as they have any authority with us, let it be in the most Reformed, purified Edition, that ever was, or can be hoped for, there is evidence enough for the Apostolicall Institution of *Bishops* in the modern.

moderne notion of the word, And if after all this they must have no *authority*, for no other *crime*, but because they are such punctuall Asserters of this *Doctrine*; 'Tis to little purpose farther to examine or inquire, what *Antiquity* hath affirmed or practised in this matter.

SECT. V.

Testimonies of Irenæus, The use of Presbyteri for Bishops.

Y^Et because their Method leads us forward to consider some other of the Antient Writers, and I have promised so farre to comply with them, I shall now in the next place attend them to the view of two of those, *Irenæus* and *Tertullian*, p. 114. 115. where having acknowledged of them that they say that Apostles made Bishops in Churches, Polycarpe in Smyrna, Clemens at Rome, &c. all that they require of us to prove, is, that by the word *Bishop* is meant a *Bishop* as distinct from *Presbyters*, and the reason why they thinke this needs proving, is, because both those Authors use the words ἐπισκοποι Bishops, and πρεσβύτεροι, *Presbyteri*, *Seniores*, for the same thing, the one calling Anicetus, Pius, Hyginus, Telephorus, Xystus, *Presbyters* of the Church of Rome in his Epistle to Victor; the other calling the Presidents of the Churches *Seniores* in his Apologie, and some other places are produced to the same purpose.

Num 1.

To this therefore I shall now briefly give answer, *i. e.* by concession that the same persons, who by these two Authors are called *Bishops*, are promiscuously called *Presbyteri* and *Seniores* also; And therefore secondly, that this question being thus farre (as to the Names) equally balanced betweene us, they saying that *Bishops* signifies *Presbyters* in the *moderne* notion, we that *Presbyters* signifies *Bishops* in the *moderne* notion, some other Indications, beside this of the Names, must be made use of on either side, toward the decision of it.

2.

Of this sort there is no one offered to us by them, and so

3.

as they have nothing to incline the *balance* their way, so we have nothing to make *answer* to in that particular. I shall therefore (as the onely thing left for me to doe) render some few Reasons, why the words *Bishop* and *Elders* in these Authors must needs signifie *Bishops* in our *Moderne* sence.

4.

And the first *proofe*, as farre as concernes *Irenæus*, is, because *Irenæus*, who useth these words *promiscuously*, was himselfe a *Bishop* in our *moderne* notion, and yet is by others in his own dayes call'd *Elder* of the *Church* of *Lyons*, at that very time, when he is acknowledged to be *Bishop* of it, in our *moderne* sence of the word; This I thus manifest in each part.

5.

* L. 5 c. 23.

And first, That *Irenæus* was *Bishop* of *Lyons*, in such a sence, as we now use *Bishop*, appeares by what * *Ensebinus* saith of him, importing that he was *Primate* of all *France*, τὸν κατὰ Γαλλίαν πατριάρχον, ὡς Ἐπισκοπῶν ἐπισκόπου, saith he, he was *Bishop* of the *Provinces* through *France*: Now this, we know, cannot be affirm'd of a *moderne* *Presbyter*, who pretends not to any such *wide* and *singular* jurisdiction; And this needs no farther *proofe*, it being by D. *Blondell* in his *Apolo- gie* for St. *Hierome* confest, that 140. yeares after *Christ*, i. e. nigh 40. yeares before this time, the *Government* of the *Church* was in the hands of *Bishops* over all the *World*, one in every *Church* set over all the rest of the *Church*.

6.

† L. 5. c. 4.

For the second part then, that at that time, when he is thus an acknowledged *Bishop* and *Arch-bishop*, he is yet called πρεσβύτερος ἐκκλησίας, *Elder* of the *Church*, I appeale to the *Testimony* of the *Gallicane* *Church*, at that time, as it lies recorded in † *Ensebinus*, where in an *Embassy* performed by him in the name of the *Martyrs* of *Lyons* to *Eleutherius* the *Bishop* of *Rome*, we have these words concerning him, ταῦτα σοι τὰ γεγυμένα πεπενημένα τὸν ἀδελφόν ἡμῶν, καὶ κοινοῦν Ἐπισκοπῶν κομίσει, Πατὴρ Ἐλευθέριε, καὶ παρακαλῶμεν ἔχειν σὺ αὐτὸν ἐν παραδείσει ζυλωμένον ὄντα τῆς διαθήκης τοῦ χριστοῦ ἔργων ἡδυνῶν τόπον τινὲ δικαιωσύνῃ πεποιτισσῶν, ὡς Πρεσβύτερον ἐκκλησίας, ὡς πρὶν ὅτι ἐν αὐτῷ ἐν πρώτοις ἂν παρεδεδίκα. We have intreated our Brother and partaker *Irenæus* to beare these Letters.

Letters to you, O Father Eleutherius, and we beseech you to prize him as one very zealous of Christ's Covenant; If we thought that Justice would purchase a place to any, we had commended him in a principall manner, as Elder of the Church, for so he is.

Here nine yeares after he had been Bishop and Archbishop of Lyons, about the yeare of Christ 177. he is styled by those Letters, Elder of the Church; by which it appears that in his time Elder was the title of Bishop, in our Moderne sense, and consequently so it may fitly signifie in his own writings, and so must needs do there, when 'tis applied to those, who were acknowledged Bishops at that time, when by the Presbyterians acknowledgement Episcopacy was come in, in that notion, wherein we now understand it.

A second prooffe of this, is, that what in one place out of Papias he saith of all the Seniores or Elders, which in Asia conuerst with St. John, that Clemens Alexandrinus, who lived in the same time, affirms of the Bishops or Elders of Asia; meaning by both of them the Bishops in our notion of the word.

Clemens Alexandrinus wrote his Stromata about the yeare 192. which is five yeares before Irenæus Martyrdom, in the 5. of Severus. Now of this Clemens, it is certaine, 1. That he acknowledged the three Orders in the Church, which he calls τὰς κατὰ τὴν ἐκκλησίαν προκοπὰς, ἐπισκόπων, πρεσβυτέρων, Strom. 6. διακόνων, the three degrees or promotions in the Church, of Bishops, Presbyters, Deacons, and consequently must by the word ἐπίσκοπος understand Bishops in our moderne sense.

Secondly, that when he makes the Relation of John's meeting with the Bishop of Asia (which is the same matter which Irenæus produreth out of Papias) he calls them in the same period both Elders and Bishops indifferently, For speaking of St John he hath this passage, Ἐλθὼν ἔνθα τινὰ τῶν ἐμα-
κρὸν πόλεον—ἐπὶ πᾶσι τῷ καθιστῶτι πρεσβύτῃ ἐπισκόπῳ, νει-
νίκον ἰδὼν, εἶπον, ἔρη. σοι πικρὸν τίδεμαι—ἵδὲ πρεσβύτερον
ἀναλαβὼν εἰκάδε—Coming to a City not farre off—and look-
ing on the Bishop, which was constituted over all, seeing a young
man,

man, he said, *This person I commit to thee—And the Elder took him home, brought him up baptized, and at last gave him confirmation.*

11.

Here it is evident this *Elder of Asia*, one of those which, in *Irenæus*, conversed with Saint *John*, is ἐπίσκοπος ἐν πάσι καθεσθώς, a *Bishop constituted over all* in that *City*; and agreeably when Saint *John* comes back that way againe, he calls to him by that title, ὁ ἐπίσκοπε τῷ παρακαλῶντι σου ἡμῖν, ᾧ ἐγώ τε καὶ ὁ χεῖρς σου παρακαλεσθέντα ἐπὶ τῆς ἐκκλησίας ἥς παραδίδωμεν σοι, *O Bishop, render us the depositum, which both I and Christ delivered to thee in the presence of the Church, over which thou art set.* Where againe he that is called *Elder* both by him and *Irenæus*, is also by him called ἐπίσκοπος ἐκκλησίας παραδεδωμένος, the *Bishop set over the Church.* And so that is a second evidence of it.

12.

Thirdly, In his *Epistle to Victor Bishop of Rome*, he speaks of his *Predecessors* thus, Οἱ πρεσβύτεροι οἱ πρεσβύτεροι τῆς ἐκκλησίας ἥς νῦν ἀρτυρῶ, Ἀνικητὸς, Πίος, Ὑγίνος τε, καὶ Τηλέφορος—*The Elders which were set over the Church which thou rulest, Anicetus, Pius, Hyginus, and Telephorus, and lib. 3. cap. 3. Θεμελιώσαντες καὶ οἰκοδομήσαντες οἱ μακάριοι Ἀπόστολοι ἐκκλησίαν, δίνω τῷ ἐπισκοπῆς λειτουργίαν ἐνεχέμεσαν—The blessed Apostles having founded and built the Church of Rome, put the Episcopal office into the hands of Linus, Anacletus succeeded him, Clemens Anacletus, Evarestus Clemens, Alexander Evarestus, then Xystus the sixth from the Apostles, after him Telephorus, then Hyginus, then Pius, after him Anicetus, after Anicetus, Soter; νῦν δωδεκάτω, ἰσθῶς ἡ τῆς ἐπισκοπῆς ἀπὸ τῶν ἀποστόλων καλεῖται κληῖρον Ἐλευθερος, Now in the twelfth place Eleutherus possesses the Bishoprick from the Apostles.*

13.

Here 1. it is evident that every one first named as *Elders*, are yet *single persons*, one succeeding another, πρεσβύτερος ἐκκλησίας: set over, or ruling the Church of Rome: Secondly, That for twelve successions together they are by *Irenæus* lookt upon all, as of the same *rank*, succeeding one another, and the first as well as the last, called *Bishop*, which must conclude it to be understood by him in such a notion, as is equally competible to all, and so must be in our *moderne* notion, if the great *Asserters*

ferers of the Presbyterian cause say true, that about the yeare 140. i. e. certainly before *Elutherius* was Bishop of Rome, there were Bishops over Presbyters all the world over.

Lastly, * *Irenæus*, speaking of some unworthy voluptuous Elders, expresseth their faults in such a manner, as cannot fitly belong to any but Bishops, *Principalis concessionis tumore elati sunt, they are puffed up with the pride of the principall place, the πρωτοκαθεδρία the principall chair, which as Bishops belonged to them.* For though it is as possible that Presbyters should be guilty of the pride, the *tumour* and elation, as that Bishops should be guilty of the same, yet the occasion of it there mentioned, the *principalis confessio*, the chiefe place of dignity, is peculiar to the one, and not reconcilable with the *ισοψηφία* or equality of the other.

14.
* L. 4. c. 44.

These evidences have readily offered themselves to shew what *Irenæus* means by *Presbyteri*, when he useth that and Bishops promiscuously, viz. by both, Bishops in our moderne notion, and he that shall reade over that author diligently, and compare his *dialekt* with *Polycarpe* and *Papias*, with whom he accords, the former using *πρεσβύτεροι* for Bishops (as hath largely been insisted on) and the latter for Apostles and Bishops, single Governors of each Church, (* *πρεσβύτεροι ἀνδρας, Euseb. l. 3. c. 39.* *Πέτρος, Ἀνδρέας, Ἰωάννης*, and elsewhere *πρεσβύτεροι Ματθαῖος. Andrew, Peter, Aristion, John, Marke*, all Elders) will doubtlesse finde many more proofes that thus he used the word, and (I shall adventure to undertake) meet with no one indication to the contrary.

15.

Sect. V.

Testimonies of Tertullian. Seniores, & Majores natu for Bishops, so in Firmilian.

AS for *Tertullian* I shall need say no more, but that it is the confession of the great Patron of Presbyterians, that he doth aperte *tueri communis usum receptam ordinis in Episcopos, Presbyteros & Diaconos, distinctionem.* Openly defend the received common distinction of the Ecclesiastick order into Bishops, Num 1. D Blondel Apol. pag. 38.

Presbyters and Deacons, and he that can yet doubt of it; let him examine his citations, de Praescript. cap. 41. de Baptismo cap 17. de Monogam. cap. 11. de Fuga c. 11. And that de Baptismo as high & cleare, as that which was most quarrell'd with in Ignatius. *Dandi Baptismum jus habet summus sacerdos, qui est Episcopus, dein Presbyteri & Diaconi, non tamen sine Episcopi auctoritate, propter honorem Ecclesiae, quo salvo salva pax est.* The Bishop hath the right of giving Baptisme, after him the Presbyters and Deacons, yet not without the authority of the Bishop, for the honour of the Church, which being preserved, peace is preserved.

2. So that of him it is as cleare, as of Irenaeus or Clemens, that he must understand Bishop in our Moderne notion: And yet even by him, these of this uppermost degree are called *Seniores*, and *Majores natu*, Elders, *Præsident probati quique Seniores*, the Elders preside, *Apol. c. 39.* and of the Bishops of Rome, the series of whom he had brought downe to Anicetus, lib. 3. *contr. Marcion. cap. 9.* he expresses them by *Majores natu*, successors of the Apostles, in his Book, written in verse, against Marcion.

3. And there will be lesse wonder in this, when it is remembred that after this in Saint Cyprian's times (who hath been sufficiently evidenced to speake of Bishops in our moderne notion of them) Firmilian Bishop of Casarea in Cappadocia, in vulgar style calls them *Seniores*, and *Præpositi*, Elders, and *Provesti*, in his Epistle to Cyprian, and againe *Præsident Majores natu*, &c. the Elders preside, evidently meaning the Bishops by those titles.

4. And so much be spoken in returne to what they have objected from these two *Antients*, Irenaeus and Tertullian, supposing that I have competently performed the taske by them imposed on the *Prelatists*, shewed that the Bishops spoken of by them, were Bishops over Presbyters, and by them understood to be so.

Sect. VI.

Saint Jerom's Testimony of Bishops, &c. by Apostolicall Tradition. Consuetudo opposed to Dominica dispositio. Saint Jerom's meaning evidenced by many other Testimonies to be, that Bishops were instituted by the Apostles. So by Panormitan also. The Testimonies of Ilidore, &c. the Council of Aquen, and of Leo vindicated. Of Ischyra's Ordination. The testimony of the Synod ad Zurrium, and of the 4th Council of Carthage.

IN the next place I am to proceed to that of Saint Hierome Num. 1.
In his 85. *Epistle ad Euagrium*, the unanswerableness of which I am affirmed to make matter of Triumph over D. Blondel and Walo Massalinus, seeming to say, that it never can be answered, whereas say they, if I had been pleased to cast an eye upon the vindication—written by Smeectymnuus, I should have found this answer—

What this answer is, we shall see anon, In the meane it will be necessary to give a brieffe account, what it was, which is called a triumphing over these two learned men. 2.

And first it is sufficiently knowne, what advantages the defenders of Presbyter conceive themselves to have from that one Antient writer, the Presbyter Saint Hierome: From him they have the interpretation of those Scriptures, which they thinke to be for their use, as that the word Bishop and Presbyter are all one in several texts of Scripture, and both signifie Presbyters, and that the Apostles at first designed, ut communis Presbyterorum concilio Ecclesia gubernarentur, that the Churches should be governed by the common Council of Presbyters, and that it so continued till upon the dissensions, which by this meanes arose in the Church, it was judged more prudent and usefull to the preserving of unity, ut unus superponeretur reliquis, that one should be set over the rest, and all the care of the Church belong to him, And this, saith Hierome, in toto Orbe decretum, decreed and executed over the whole world. 3.

By whom this was conceived, by him to be thus decreed, he gives us not to understand in that place, nor in what point 4.

of time he thought it was done, but leaves us to collect both from some few *circumstances*; as 1. that it was after *Schismes* entred into the Church, and one said *I am Paul, of Apolos, &c.* And if it were immediately after that, then the *Presbyterians* will gaine but little by this *Patron*: For his whole meaning will be, that the *Apostles* first put the *Government* of each Church into the hands of many, but soon saw the inconvenience of doing so, and the *Schisme* and *ruptures* consequent to it, and changed it themselves, and setled one singular *Bishop* in the whole power of *Government* in every Church, to which very fitly coheres what *Clement* had said, that *lest new contentions should arise about this singular dignity and authority* who should succeed to it, they made a roll or *Catalogue* of those, which in *vacancies* should succeed in each Church.

5. That this was not, in *Hierome's* opinion, done thus early in the *Apostles* time, the *Presbyterians* think they may conclude from what he saith on *Tis. 1. Episcopi noverint se magis consuetudine quam dispositionis Dominica veritate Presbyteris esse Majores.* Let *Bishops* know that their greatnesse and superiority over *Presbyters* is held rather by *custome*, than by *Christ's* having disposed it so. But it is very possible that this may not prove the conclusion, which is thought to be inferred by it, For here *Consuetudo, Custome*, as opposed to *Christ's disposition*, may well signifie the *Practice* of the Church in the later part of the *Apostles* times, and ever since to *S. Hierome's* days, and that may well be severed from all command, or institution of *Christ's*, & *Iosferom's* opinion may well be this, that *Christ* did not ordain this superiority of one above another, but left all in common in the *Apostles* hands, who within awhile, to avoid *Schism*, put the power in each Church in the hands of some one singular person.

6. And that this was *Hierome's* meaning, I thought my selfe, in charity to him, obliged to thinke, both because in this sense his words would better agree with the universal affirmation of all *Orthodoxe Christians*, that before him (and after him too, unlesse those few that took it on his credit) speake of this matter, and also, because if this be not his sense, he must needs be found to contradict himselfe, having elsewhere affirmed that the three degrees of *Bishops, Presbyters* and *Deacons* in the Church

Church were of Apostolicall tradition, i. e. by the Apostles themselves delivered to the Church.

And now before I proceed, I desire the ingenuous Reader, who is contrary minded, to consider, what he can object to this conclusion of mine thus infer'd concerning S. Hierome's opinion, and consequently what probability there is, that the Presbyterians cause should be superstructed on any Testimony of S. Hierome, supposing what I am next to demonstrate, that the three orders are by him acknowledged to be delivered from the Apostles.

And this is evident in his Epistle to Euagrius, where having againe delivered the substance of what hath been now cited from his notes on Tit. i. he yet concludes, *Et ut sciamus traditiones Apostolicas sumptas de veteri testamento, Quod Aaron & filii ejus atque Levita in templo fuerunt, hoc sibi Episcopi & Presbyteri & Diaconi in Ecclesia vendicent.* That we may know that the Apostles traditions are taken out of the Old Testament, we have this instance, that what Aaron and his Sonnes and the Levites were in the Temple, the same the Bishops and Presbyters and Deacons challenge to themselves in the Church. Where these three degrees (and so the superiority of Bishops over Presbyters) are by him affirmed to be traditions of the Apostles.

8.

On occasion therefore of inquiring into Hierome's meaning (and because this place so readily offered it selfe to expedite it) it was sure very reasonable to examine, and observe, what they which made most advantage of Hierome's authority, should be found to say to this testimony of his, for the Apostolical tradition of three orders. And among these, three principall persons offered themselves to our consideration, D. Blondell, w^{ro} M^{ss}salinus, or Salmasius, and Lnd. Capellus, every of them having newly written on this subject, and collected especially what Hierome had said of it.

9.

Of these three the last was soone discerned to have dealt most prudently, setting downe the other testimonies out of him, but wholly omitting this; The other two having not been so wary, made use of another dexterity, set downe the words, but deferr'd their observations on them, till some

10.

fitter season ; D. Blondell put it off to his *sixt Section*, where-as upon examination he hath but *three* in his whole *booke*, and so is certainly never likely to speake of it, nor can be justly believed to have, in earnest designed any such thing : The other saith, he *expects more and better notes on it from Salmasius* (i.e. from himselfe) in another *booke*, viz. *De Ecclesiastico Ordine*, and after a great *volume* come out of that *subject* 8. or 9. yeares after, he yet never takes this place, or his own *promise* into consideration.

11. This was all that my search produced, and the taking notice of these *plaine matters of fact*, the behaviours of these men in that, which so much concern'd the whole *cause* to be taken notice of, and laid to *heart*, is all that was done by me, and which is styled by these a *triumphing over those learned Men*. And I hope there was little of *hard measure*, and as little of *insolence* in this.

12. Now because what these *learned Men* thus averted the doing, is yet here said to be done by *Smectymunus*, and that if I had cast an eye on the *vindication*—I should there have found that place of Hierome's answered, I am now in the last place to obey their directions, and consider the *answer*, which from *Smectymunus* they have set down for me.

13. And it is *twofold*, the first is a *civill denyall* that there is any *truth* in the words, For, say they, *It is hard to conceive how this imparity can be properly called an Apostolicall Tradition*, when Jerome, having mentioned John the *last of the Apostles*, saith it was *possea*, that one was *set over the rest*.

14. But is this the way of *answering* the place, or salving the difficulty ? Hierome saith, *Bishops, Presbyters and Deacons* in the Church (that sure is this *imparity*) are an *Apostolicall Tradition* ; and they answer, *It is hard to conceive how it can be properly so called*. What is this but to make Hierome's words (as soome as ever he saith any thing which accords not with their *interest*) as *unreconcilable* with truth, as with his *own former words*, which they had cited from him ? And then how much kinder to Hierome was I than they, who thought it necessary to affix a *commodious meaning* to his former words, and interpret *consuetudo*] the *custome* of the Church

Church begun in the *Apostles* dayes, that so in thus saying, he might be reconcileable with himself, when he called *Episcopacy* a tradition *Apostolicall*?

As for the reason, which makes this so hard for them to conceive from *Hierome's* words, I believe it hath no force in it; For though after the mention of *S. Iohn's* words in his second and third Epistle, he saith that [*postea, afterwards*] this *imparity* was introduced, yet this proves not his opinion to be, that it was not *Apostolicall tradition*; It might be done after the writing of those Epistles, and yet in *St. Iohn's* time, i. e. before his death. And though I believe *St. Hierome* was mistaken, in thinking there were no *Bishops* till then (it would have had more truth in it, if he had said there were no *Presbyters* till then) yet for all that, I cannot doubt but this was his opinion, because as he no where saith any thing which is contrary to this, so here he saith expressly that it was *Apostolicall tradition*, which in his opinion it could not be, if it were not in the Church, in his opinion, before *St. Iohn's* death. And so there is but little appearance of validity in their first Answer.

15.

And for their second, that is somewhat like the former, viz. that with *Hierome* *Apostolicall tradition* and *Ecclesiasticall customs* are the same.

16.

If this be true, then certainly I did not amisse in thinking that when *Hierome* used *consuetudo customis* in opposition to *Dominica dispositio*, *Christ's* appointment or institution, I ought to interpret *customis* in that place, by *Apostolicall Tradition* in the other. For how *Ecclesiasticall customs* with him, and *Apostolicall Tradition* should be the same, and yet *Ecclesiasticall customs* may not be interpreted by *Apostolicall tradition*, especially when the same man affirms them both of the same thing, I confesse I cannot apprehend.

17.

But then secondly, because I must suppose, that by making them the same, they must meane to bring downe *Apostolicall tradition* to signifie *Ecclesiasticall customs*, not to advance *customis* to signify *Apostolicall tradition*; in the same manner as when they make *Bishop* and *Elder* the same, they bring down *Bishop* to signifie *Presbyter*, but will not allow *Elder*

18.

to signifie *Bishop*) that also will be worth *examining* a while.

19.

And 1. Can there be any reason to imagine, that *Hierome* or any man should set down that for an *instance of Apostolicall tradition*, which the same person doth not believe to be delivered by the *Apostles*, but to be of a *latter date*? That which is delivered by the *Apostles*, and received, and practiced by the *Church*, may fitly be called a *custome of the Church*, without adding or specifying, that we meane the *Apostolicall Church*, because the *Apostles*, while they lived, were a *part* of the *Church*, and the following age was a *part* of the *Church* also. But can it be truly said, that that was delivered by the *Apostles*, which was onely accustomed in the subsequent *Church*, and not so much as introduced under the *Apostles*?

20.

This certainly is another strange way of interpreting words or phrases quite contrary to all *Lexicons*, or to the use of such words or phrases, which unlesse they be changed, it is as much as to say, he that said *Tradition Apostolicall*, did not meane *Tradition Apostolicall*; And this sure will bring little credit to *St. Hierome*, on whose authority they so much depend in this matter.

21.

As for their prooffe of what they say, viz. because the observation of *Lent*, which he saith, ad *Marcellum*, is *Apostolica traditio*, is contra *Luciferianos*, said by him to be *Ecclesiæ consuetudo*,] that sure is not of force to conclude what they would have it, for it may be (or by him be deemed to be) both, an *Apostolicall tradition* and a *custome* of the *Church* too, it being very ordinary and reasonable, that what the *Apostles* delivered, the *Church* should also accustom, and practice. But could both these be said by him of that which he thought were but one of these? That is againe to make him resist against his conscience, to say *Lent* was an *Apostolicall tradition*, and to believe it was not an *Apostolicall tradition*.

22.

Here I shall not need debate whether the observation of *Lent* were *Apostolicall*, or no; All that is necessary to insist on, is, whether *Saint Hierome*, that said it was such, believed it to be such, And if he be mistaken in his believe, then he may be as well mistaken in the meaning of those passages, which he

interprets so, as is usefull to, and in favour of the *Presbyterians*, as that *πρεσβύτεροι Elders, Act. 20.* were the *Presbyters* of the Church of *Ephesus*; that the *ἐπίσκοποι Bishops, Phil. 1.* are *Presbyters* of that one Church or City, and the like. For either of those is but his *believe* or *perswasion* too, and the more fallible they finde him in other things, the lesse weight they ought to lay on his opinion in this, and the lesse blame on us, for departing from his opinion.

But having said this *πρὸς ὑμᾶς*, for the repelling all force of their objection, I shall now adde some other testimonies out of Saint Hierome, and after them, one argument, ad homines undeniable, to demonstrate, that it was indeed and without question S. Hierome's opinion, that *Bishops* in our moderne notion were instituted by the *Apostles* themselves.

23.

1. In his 54. *Epistle* he sets downe this difference among others, between the *Catholikes* and the *Montanist hereticks*, *Apud nos Apostolorum locum tenent Episcopi, apud eos Episcopus tertius est, Among the Catholikes the Bishops (such as were in S. Hierome's time, i. e. certainly such as in ours not mere Presbyters) hold the place of the Apostles (i. e. the uppermost place in the Church of Christ, and succeed the Apostles in it) and among those Hereticks the Bishop is the third, which it seems was one character of their being Heretick, and so a deviation from an Apostolical truth.)*

24.

2. In his Booke *de script. Eccl.* he saith of James the brother of the Lord Jacobus ab Apostolis statim post ascensionem Domini Hierosolymorum Episcopus ordinatus, suscepit ecclesiam Hierosolyma. Timothy à Paulo Ephesiorum Episcopus ordinatus, Titus Creta, Polycarpus à Johanne Smyrna Episcopus Ordinatus. James presently after Christs Ascension, was ordained Bishop of Hierusalem, and undertook (i. e. ruled, as to receive the Congregation, Psal. 75. is to rule it) the Church of Hierusalem, Timothy was ordained Bishop of the Ephesians by Paul, Titus of Crete, Polycarpus was by John ordained Bishop of Smyrna. Where, as it is evident, and by the *Presbyterians* acknowledged, that Timothy and Titus were singular rulers (which therefore they are wont to excuse by saying they are extraordinary officers or Evangelists) and yet by him said to be Bishops of

25.

Ephesus and Crete, and so constituted by the *Apostles*, so it is consequent that *James* and *Polycarpe* were by him deemed singular rulers also (and not *Collegues* in a *Presbytery*) and those so constituted by the *Apostles* also, and accordingly of this *James* he saith, *ad Gal. 2. Jacobus primus ei Ecclesia praefuit. Episcopus Hierosolymorum primus fuit.* *James was the first that was set over that Church—was the first Bishop of Hierusalem.* And in consequence thereto in his comments on *Isa. lib. 5. cap. 17.* he calls this *James* *Decimum tertium Apostolum* the thirteenth *Apostle*

26.

* Tag. 85.

3. In like manner * *Epist. ad Euagrium*, speaking of *Marke* (who dying in the 8th. of *Nero*, what was done by him, must be resolved to have been in the *Apostles* times, and agreeable to their practice] he saith, *Alexandria à Marco Evangelistâ ad Heraclum & Dionysium Episcopos Presbyteri semper unum ex se electum in excelsiori super Presbyteros gradu collocatum, Episcopum nominabant, quomodo si exercitus Imperatorem faceret.* At *Alexandria* from the time of *Marke* the *Evangelist*, to the time of *Heraclius* and *Dionysius* Bishops, the *Presbyters* always named one chosen from among themselves, and placed in an higher degree above *Presbyters*, their *Bishop*, as if an army should choose their *Generall*. That what is said of the *Presbyters* choosing their *Bishop*, belongs not to *Presbyters* imposing hands on him, is * elsewhere largely evidenced. And so, by the way, appeareth the falsenesse of the citation out of *Jerome*, *Appen. p. 142.* that in *Alexandria* for a long time the *Presbyters* ordained (it should have been said elected) their *Bishop*. That which I here inferre from the testimony is manifest, viz. that in *Saint Markes* time, and from the first planting of the Church at *Alexandria*, one *Bishop* or singular *Ruler* was constituted among them, as that signifies an higher degree than that of *Presbyters*.

* Dissert. 3.

cap 10.

27.

4. More places there are in him, which evidence his opinion, that *Bishops*, as they differ from *Presbyters*, are successors of the *Apostles*: In his Comment on *Psal. 45. Nunc quia Apostoli à mundo recesserunt, habes pro his Episcopos filios, sunt & hi patres tui, quia ab ipsis regeris.* Now (in *S. Hierome's* time) because the *Apostles* are parted from the world, you have in their
stead

steads Bishops their Sonnes; They also are thy Fathers, because thou art governed by them. Where the Bishops that then ruled (those are confest to be single persons, not Presbyteries) are the successors of the Apostles in his opinion. And Ep. 1. ad Heliadonum, of not undertaking the office of Bishop. *Non est facile stare loco Pauli, tenere gradum Petri;* 'tis not easie to stand in Pauls place, to hold the degree of Peter. Where Episcopacy is the place and degree of those Apostles. And so Ep. 13. ad Paulinum, *Episcopi & Presbyteri habent in exemplum Apostolos & Apostolicos viros, quorum honorem possidentes habere nitantur & meritum,* Bishops and Presbyters must have for their Examples the Apostles and Apostolical men, whose honour they possess, and therefore ought to endeavour to imitate their me: it.

28.

5. I shall adde a *Cumulus* of other passages much to the same purpose with the former, and fit to be taken in conjunction with them, to give us the full understanding of S. Hierome's opinion in this matter. *Ad Nepotian. Ep. 2. Esto subiectus Pontifici tuo, & quasi anima parentem suscipe, quod Aaron & filius ejus, hoc Episcopum & Presbyteros esse noverimus.* Be subject to the Bishop, and receive him as the parent of thy Soule, what Aaron and his Sonnes were, that we must know the Bishop and Presbyters to be. And on *Tit. 1.* speaking of S. Paul's directions for the making a Bishop, *Apostolus*, saith he, *Ecclesia Principem formans,* the Apostle forming the Prince or ruler of the Church, and so againe in the same words on *Psal. 45.* deciphering a single ruler by that Bishop, which the Apostle there meant to forme. So on that *45. Psal. Constituit Christus in omnibus finibus mundi Principes Ecclesie Episcopos,* Christ in all parts of the world constituted Princes of the Church, the Bishops, just the same as hath beene cited from Ignatius, that all the world over, the Bishops were ordained by the Apostles according to the minde of Christ. In his *Dial. adv. Luciferian.* *Ecclesia salus in summi sacerdotis dignitate pendet, cui si non exors quidam & ab omnibus eminens detur potestas, tot in Ecclesia efficientur Schismata quot sacerdotes;* and, *Si queris quare in Ecclesia baptizatus, nisi per manus Episcopi non accipiat spiritum sanctum—dice hanc observationem ex ea autoritate descendere, quod spiritus sanctus ad Apostolos descendit.* The safety of

* In toto orbe
decuratum ut unus
de Presbyteris
electus superpo-
nereetur ceteris
ad quem omnis
Ecclesiæ cura
pertineret, ut
schismatum se-
mina tollerentur,
and Paulatim
ut diffensionum
semina tolleretur,
ad unum
omnis sollicitudo
declata est Com
ad Tit

the Church depends on the dignity of the chiefe Priest (or Bishop) to whom, if a peculiar power be not given above all that others have, there will be as many Schisms as Priests in the Churches — If you demand why he that hath been baptized in the Church, may not receive the Holy Ghost but by the hands of the Bishop, learns that this observance descends from that Authority, in that the holy spirit descended on the Apostles. Which Testimony, as it shewes the necessity of a singular Bishop to avoid Schisms in the Church, and so must affixe the institution of them on the Apostles, who made provision against that danger (and that I suppose is his meaning in * that place which the Presbyterians make most use of) so it directly derives the authority, by which Bishops stand in the Church, distinct from Presbyters, and above them from the descent of the Holy Ghost on the Apostles. Lastly, *adv. Joannian.* 1. *Episcopus & Presbyter & Diaconus non sunt meritorum nomina sed officiorum. Nec dicitur, si quis Episcopatum desiderat.*—The Bishop and Presbyter and Deacon. are names of offices, neither is it said, If any man desire a Bishoprick—applying those Texts of Saint Paul, concerning the qualifications of Bishops to the Bishop, as in his time he stood, distinct from Presbyters.

29.

All this I suppose may suffice to give authority to my collection and conclusion from plaine words of Saint Hierome, that his meaning was as plaine and undubitable, that *Episcopacy* was delivered downe and instituted in the Church by the Apostles themselves. And I cannot conceive what can be invented to avoid the evidence of these testimonies; yet because I promised it, I shall now adde that one argument (*ex abundanti*, and much more than is necessary) to the same purpose, (*viz.* to prove that this was Hierome's meaning, which I pretend it to be.) And that such, as by these objectors cannot with justice be denied, to have a full irrefragable force in it, having themselves made use of it against us, which they ought not to have done, if by themselves it shall now be denied when it is produced by us.

30.

In the close of their Appendix, they have set downe several propositions declaring the judgement and practice of the Antient Church about ordination of Ministers, and their first proposition, being

being this, that in the first and purest times—there was ordination of Presbyters without Bishops over Presbyters, their prooffe is this. For these Bishops came in postea and paulatim, after ward, and by little and little as Jerome saith. And Panormitan, lib. 1. Decretal. de Consuetud. cap. 4. saith *Olim Presbyteri in communi regebant Ecclesiam & ordinabant sacerdotes, & pariter conferebant omnia sacramenta* Of old the Elders ruled the Church in common, and ordained Priests, and joyntly conferred all the Sacraments.

These two testimonies of Hierome and Panormitan, being brought to prove the same proposition concerning ordination by Presbyters, and the time of Bishops coming in to the Church, It must sure be reasonable to resolve that what Panormitan hath defined in this matter, that was Saint Hieromes sense also; Now what that is, will be discerned by setting downe Panormitane's words at large, as they lye in the place cited by them.

The businesse he hath there in hand is to prove that custome is not of force so farre, as to prescribe that an Ordinary Clerk as Presbyter shoud performe an Episcopal act, *Ea quæ sunt ordinis Episcopalis non possunt acquiri per ordinem inferiorem ex consuetudine quantamcunque vetustissima*. Those things that are of Episcopal order cannot by any custome, how antient soever, be acquired by any Inferiour order: The reasonis, *quia consuetudo non facit quem capacem*, because custome doth make no man capable—Then he makes this observation, that *Ritus Apostolorum circa sacramenta habent impedire characteris impressionem*; The rites, or practice, or Institutions of the Apostles about the Sacraments, have power to hinder the impression of the Character, nam immediately post mortem Christi omnes Presbyteri in communi regebant ecclesiam, non fuerant inter ipsos Episcopi, sed idem Presbyter quod Episcopus, & pariter conferebant omnia sacramenta, sed postmodum ad Schismata sedanda fecerunt seu ordinaverunt Apostoli, ut crearentur Episcopi. & certa sacramenta eis reservarunt, illa interdicens simplicibus Presbyteris—For immediately after the death of Christ, all the Elders in common ruled the Church, and so there were no Bishops among them, but a Presbyter was the same that a Bishop, and they joyntly conferred all the Sacraments. But

As 3.

after.

31.

32.

after a while for the appeasing of Schismes the Apostles caused or ordained that Bishops should be created, and reserved to them some Sacraments (or holy Rites) forbidding single Presbyters to meddle with them: and he concludes, *Et videt hic quod talis ordinatio habet impedire etiam impressionem Characteris, quia si Presbyteri illa de facto conferunt, nihil conferunt, and here you see; that such an Ordination is able to hinder the impression of the Character, because if Presbyters doe de facto confer them, they confer nothing.*

33. Where, as Panormitan cited by them to prove Ordination without Bishops (and specious words pickt out of him to that purpose) doth yet distinctly affirme that Presbyters, which confer Orders without a Bishop conferre nothing, all their Ordinations are meere nullities (and what could have been said more severely against their practice, and their designe in citing him, than this ?) so he plainly interprets St. Jeromes assertion of the occasion and time of Bishops being set over the Presbyters, that it was done by the appointment of the Apostles themselves, and so that *consuetudo, custome in Jerome*, opposed to *Dominica dispositio Christi's disposall*, is no more than [*postmodum ordinaverunt Apostoli, after a while the Apostles ordained*] opposed to [*immediate post mortem Christi, immediately after the death of Christ.*]

34. And then by the way, as the Reader may hence discern what force there is, in this Testimony of Panormitan to support their first proposition concerning the Ordination of Presbyters without Bishops over Presbyters (for which besides St. Jeromes *postea* and *paulatim*, and part of this testimony of Panormitan, they produce no other) and as by what was formerly said of the Testimonies of Cyprian and Firmilian, * *Append. p. 129* their chiefe supports for their * *second proposition*, have already been utterly demolished, so also the Testimonies of Isidore Hispalensis and the Council of Aguen produced for the prooffe of their † *third Proposition*, concerning the Presbyters having an *intrinsic* power to ordaine Ministers, will immediately vanish in like manner. For as it is evident that that place in that council of Aguen is for nine Chapters together transcribed out of Isidore, and consequently the
Te.

Testimonies out of him and that *concell* are but one and the same thing, twice repeated, to increase the number, so 'tis as evident that what is by them said, is taken from St. *Hierome*, and can no farther be extended either in respect of the authority or the matter of the *Testimony*, than in St. *Hierome* it hath appeared to extend. And therefore as the * words cited by these men out of them are no more than these, that *so'um propter auctoritatem Clericorum ordinatio & consecratio reservata est summo sacerdoti*, That *Presbyters* have many things common with *Bishops*, onely in respect of authority (or for the preserving it intire, and the unity of each Church, which depended on that, in St. *Hierom's* opinion) the Ordination and consecration of Clerks (i.e. of all *Presbyters* and *Deacons*) was reserved to the chiefe Priest, i.e. the *Bishop*; which how farre it is from concluding what it was brought to prove, the intrinsick power of *Presbyters* to ordaine *Ministers*, I leave to any Reader to passe judgement. And yet truly this doth it as well as their one other ancient *Testimonie*, that of *Leo*, set out in their front, out of his 88. *Epistle*, concerning the Consecration of *Presbyters* and *Deacons*, and some other things, *Que omnia solis debent Pontificibus auctoritate canonum precipitur*, All which that they should be due to the *Bishops* and to none else, it is commanded by the authority of the *Canons*. Who would ever have thought fit from such words as these, which affirme this privilege to be reserved particularly to the *Bishops*, and that the authority of the *Canons* so requires, to conclude that the *Presbyters* had this intrinsick power; As if all that the *Canons* deny *Presbyters*, were infallibly their due to enjoy, and the Argument demonstrative, that it was their *Originall* and intrinsick due, because the *Canons* deny it.

Append p. 143.

What they adde of *Ischyra's* Prop. 6. that being deposed from being a *Presbyter*, because made by *Colluthus* who was but a *Presbyter* himsele, and not a *Bishop*, this was done, not because the act of *Colluthus* was against the Canon of Scripture, but onely because it was against the *Canons* of some counells.] is somewhat of the same nature with the former, and will be best judged of by the relation of the Fact, which in the story of

35.
P. 143.

L. i. c. 20.

of those times is thus made by *Socrates*, Πρώτου ἰδὼν πολλῶν θανάτων ἀξίον ἰδεσθῆναι γὰρ ἱερωσίης τυχῶν τὸ τῷ πρεσβυτέρῳ ὄνομα ἑαυτῷ περιδέσθαι τὰ ἱερωεὺς πράττειν ἰτόλμουν, *He adventured on a thing worthy of many Deaths, for being never admitted to the Priesthood, and assuming to himselfe the name of an Elder, he dared to doe the things belonging to a Priest. A censure which certainly sets the fault somewhat higher than the transgressing of the Canons of some Councils.*

36. Two Testimonies more I shall touch on, before I returne to the pursuit of my proposed Method, and then I shall render the reason of this *Excursion*.

37. For the confirmation of their second Proposition concerning Ordination, one Testimony they produce from the *Synod ad Quercum* Ann. 403. where it was brought as an accusation against *Chrysostome*, ὅτι πολλὰς ἀμαρτίας ἐχρηάτοισεν, ὅτι ἀνεὺ συνεδρείου καὶ παρὲς γνώμης τῆς κλήρης ἐποίησε τὰς χειροτονίας, *That he made Ordinations without the company and sentence of the Clergy.* Another from the councell of *Carthage* Can. 20. Ut Episcopus sine Concilio Clericorum suorum non ordinet, *That a Bishop ordeine not Clerkes without the Councell of his owne Clerkes,* and Can. 2. Cum Ordinatur Presbyter Episcopo eum benedicente, & manum super caput ejus tenente, etiam omnes Presbyteri qui praesentes sunt manus suas juxta manum Episcopi super caput illius teneant. *When a Presbyter is Ordained, as the Bishop blesteth him and layes his hand on his head, let all the Presbyters also that are present lay their hands on his Head by the Hand of the Bishop.* And the conclusion deduced from these Testimones (and the forementioned of *Cyprian* and *Fermilian*) is this, that Ordination by Bishops without the assistance of his Presbyters was alwaies forbidden and opposed. How truly this is inferred from the *Premises* will soone be judged by a view of the Testimonies.

38. For the first, this is the truth of the story, *Theophilus* a guilty person, and as such, cited to answer, what was objected against him, making use of the envy, under which *Chrysostome* then laboured, shifted the Scene, and became his judge, nay, as *Photius* tells us, he and the rest of that Convencicle,

venticle, οἱ τὰ μακίστ' ἀνιστάμενοι ἐχθροὶ πρὸς τὸν ἄνδρα, *that were Chrysostome's greatest enemies, ἀμα πάντα καὶ κείται, καὶ κατήγοροι, καὶ μαρτυροὶ ἅπαν, were at once Judges, and Accusers, and Witnesses of all that was charged against him.* And therefore we already see, what heed is to be given to the *accusatio* of those Fathers *ad quercum*, and how *valid* an argument can be deduced from it; And we shall the better guess at it, if we consider also, what other *particulars* were, in the same manner that this was, *charged* against him, set downe by Photius in his *Bibliotheca*. The 23. charge was, ὅτι αὐτῷ μόνῳ λυτέον ὑποκρίσθαι—*that the Bath was heated for him alone, and that after he had bathed, Serapion shuts the passage into the Bath, that no body else might bath:* The 25. ὅτι μόνῳ ἐδίει,—*that he ate alone, living like one of the Cyclopes,* and betwixt these two new found crimes, comes in this, in the midst, being the 24. ὅτι πολλοὶ ἀμαρτύροι ἐχειροτόνησαν, *that he ordained many that had no Testimonials;* which being set down by Photius, as the summe of that charge, referres us indeed to the ground, on which their charge was built, of his *ordaining without a Councell*, and against the minds of his *Clergy*, (those testimonials, and so the approbation of the person by the *Clergy* being generally a good preparation to the receiving Orders) but doth not at all prove that a *Bishop* might not ordaine without assistance of his *Presbyters*, or that it was *alwayes* forbidden, any more than it proves that *eating or bathing alone* was *alwayes* forbidden also.

As for that of the 4. Councell of Carthage Can. 20. They have set downe but halfe the Canon; the whole runnes thus, *Ut Episcopus sine concilio Clericorum non ordinet, ita ut civium conviventiam & Testimonium querat, That the Bishop ordain not without his councell of Clergy, so that he seeke the liking and testimoniall of the Inhabitants.* Which againe onely serves to shew, the use of the *assistent Presbyters*, to helpe the *Bishop* to a due knowledge of the person to be ordained (and this they know we *Prelatists* assent to and approve of) but is no argument of the *unlawfulness* of *sole ordination*, or of any power that the *Presbyters* have in the *confering* of Orders.

39.

40. So likewise that from *Cam. 2.* is onely a *Testimony* for the *fitnesse* and *usefulness* of that *custome* (still retain'd and used in our *Church* in all *Ordinations* of *Presbyters* and *Deacons*) that the *Presbyters* there *present* should *lay* on their *hands* by the *hand* of the *Bishop*, and so *joyne* in the *Prayer* of *benediction*, but no *proofe* that a *Presbyter* might not be *ordained* by a *Bishop* without the *presence* of such *Presbyters*.

41. I have for a while gone aside from the consideration of *St. Hierome's testimony* (the designed matter of this *Section*) and allowed my *selfe* *scope* to take in all the *testimonies* of *Antiquity*, which are made use of by these *Assemblers*, for the justifying their *Ordination* of *Ministers*; And I have done it on purpose (though a little contrary to my designed *Method* and *brevity*) because after the publishing of the *Dissertations* against *Blondel*, I remember I was once told, that though it was not *necessary*, yet I might do well to add some *Appendix*, by way of *Answer* to that one head of *discourse* concerning *Presbyteriall Ordination*, and the *Instances* which were objected by him. For which reason I have now, as near as I can, taken in all, in this place, which are in their *Appendix* produced on that head, and doe not elsewhere in this *briefe* reply, fall in my way to be answered by me. For some others, mentioned by *D. Blondel*, I refer the *Reader* to the learned *paines* of the *Bishop* of *Derry*, in his vindication of the *Church* of *England* from the aspersion of *Schisme*, p. 270. &c.

42. And so being at last returned into my rode againe, This may, I hope, suffice to have said in the justification of what was done in the *Dissertations* concerning *St. Hierome*, both to cleare his *sense*, and for the setting the *ballance* aright betwixt his authority on the one side, and the authority of *Ignatius* on the other, betwixt some doubtfull sayings of the former, which seemed to *prejudice* the *Doctrine* of the *Apostles* instituting *imparity*, which yet elsewhere he *affirmes* to be *Apostolicall* tradition, and the many cleare and *uncontradicted*, constant sayings of the latter, which are acknowledged to assert it. Which one thing, if it be not in the *Dissertations* so done,

as may satisfie any impartiall Judge, that Ignatius, in full concord with all, is to be heeded on our side, more than St. Hierome, in some few of his many Testimones, can be justly produced against us, I shall then confesse my selfe guilty of over-much confidence; but if therein I have not erred, it is most evident that I need not undertake any farther travaile in this whole matter.

Sect. VII.

The Testimonies of Ambrose and Austine. Consignare used for consecrating the Eucharist, and that belonged to the Bishop when present.

Here now followes in the next place the passage cited by them p. 133. out of Ambrose on Eph. 4. where to prove that even during the prevalency of Episcopacy 'twas not held unlawfull for a Presbyter to ordaine without a Bishop, they urge out of St. Ambrose these words, *Apud Egyptum Presbyteri consignans, si praesens non sit Episcopus, In Egypt the Presbyters consign, if the Bishop be not present.* And the like out of Austine (or whosoever was the Author) in *Quaest. ex utroque Testam. Qu. 101. In Alexandria & per totam Egyptum, si desit Episcopus, consecrat Presbyter, In Alexandria and through all Egypt, if the Bishop be wanting, the Presbyter consecrates.* And having done so, they adde, which words cannot be understood (as a defender of Prelacy would have them) of the Consecration of the Eucharist; For this might be done by the Presbyter praesente Episcopo, the Bishop being present, but it must be understood either of confirmation, or (which is more likely) of ordination, because Ambrose in that place is speaking of Ordination.

Num. 1.

To this I shall briefly reply, 1. That it is sure enough, & granted by the most eminent Presbyterians, that these two Books, whence these Testimonies are cited, were not written either by Ambrose or Austine, but by some other (Hilarium Sardus, saith Blondel) and unjustly inserted among their works, and then the authority of such supposititious pieces will not be

2.

great to over-rule any practice otherwise acknowledged in the Church of God.

3.

Secondly, that the mistakes of *Blondel* and *Salmasius*, concerning the meaning of the former of these places, were so evidently discovered by the second of them (the *consignant* in the one, interpreted by *consecrat* in the other) that I conceived it sufficient, but to name them, For can there be any thing more unquestionable than this, that *consecrare* in ancient writers signifies the Consecration of the Eucharist? And then if *consignare* be a more obscure phrase, is there any doubt, but it must be interpreted by that which is so much more vulgar and plaine? and all the circumstances besides being exactly the same in both places, what doubt can there be, but in both, the words are to be understood of the Eucharist?

4.

Yet because some advantage was by this their misunderstanding sought to the Presbyterians cause, they now resolve, and insist, that it must not be rectified, though they know not which to apply it to, Confirmation or Ordination, and pretend not to produce any Testimony, where *consecrare* is ever used for the latter, or *consignare* for either of them. And indeed * *Blondel* and † *Salmasius* were yet more uncertain, for they thought it might also belong to the benediction of Penitent, and that as probable as either of the two former; And when the truth is rejected, thus it is wont to be.

* *Apol.* p. 57.
† *Appar. ad. lib.*
de Prim.

5.

As for the onely reason which inclines them to confine it to Ordination, because *Ambrose* in that place is speaking of Ordination, if the place be review'd, it will not be found to have truth in it; He speaks immediately before of the severall Ministeriall Acts, Preaching and Baptizing, adding indeed that *Scripta Apostoli non per omnia conveniunt Ordinationi, que nunc in Ecclesia est*, The writings of the Apostle doe not in all things agree to the Order, which is now in the Church. There is mention of *Ordinatio* indeed, but that signifies not Ordination, as we now use it for ordaining of Ministers, but manifestly the *Quarta*, the rule, or order used in the Church, in severall respects, saith he, different from what it was in the writings of the Apostle.

And

And for their objection against my interpretation, that it cannot be understood of consecrating the Eucharist, [because this the Presbyter might doe when the Bishop was present] If they would have taken notice of the many evidences brought by me in that place out of the *Antients*, the Canons of the *Apostles*, *Ignatius ad Magnes.* the 56 Canon of the councell of *Laodicea*, and *Tertullian*, that the Presbyter might not administer either Sacrament without the Bishop's appointment, and distinctly of this Sacrament: *Non de aliorum quam de Presidentium manu Eucharistiam sumimus*, we receive it not from the hands of any but the Presidents, i. e. (in his style) the Bishops, *Tertull: de Cor. Mil.* they could never have thought this a reasonable Objection, It being evidently the sense of the Antient Canons, (to which the description of the practice in *Justin Martyr* doth perfectly agree, *Apol. 2.*) that onely the Bishop had power to consecrate the Eucharist, and in his absence onely, the Presbyter, to whom he gave that power.

Had they been pleased to have taken notice of these *Canons* and *antient Records*, punctually set downe by mee in that place, it must certainly have prevented this their exception, and utterly robbed them of those two Testimonies to that Proposition. And as to that of the *Alexandrian Bishops* out of *Hierome*, that is also largely answered by me, *Dissert. 3 c. 10.* but that againe they were resolved not to take notice of.

Sect. VIII.

Of the Chorepiscopi.

There still remains one mention of me, upon occasion of the *Chorepiscopi* or *Regionary Bishops*, *Append. p. 138.* Of that subject they are somewhat large, and so D. *Blondel* had been before them, and in answering him, all their pretensions from thence, and that whole argument (by them pursued *P. 135, 136, 137, 138.*) is punctually answered, before it was produced, *Dissert. 3, c. 8.*

B b 3

And

6.

7.

Num. 1.

2. And yet they go on roundly, as if there were no such thing, onely in the *close* they adde, *There is another whom we forbear to name, that saith that the Chorepiscopi were Bishops. But hee addes, though they were Bishops, yet they were made but by one Bishop, and Bishops meerly titular and sine Cathedralâ, which is all one as if he should say, they were not properly Bishops.*

3. That which is said of the *Chorepiscopi* in the *Dissertations* is too long to be here so impertinently repeted, If the Reader please to consult the place, I have no feare that he will returne unsatisfied in any thing that is by these men objected against *Pralacy* from that head. A *Dilemma* is there used, which, whether they were *Bishops* or no, will certainly secure us.

4. As to their present argument against me, I answer, that what I say of those *Chorepiscopi*, is, not that they were *Bishops meerly titular*, but that they were *Proxies* or *vicarii* of the *Bishop of the City*, acting by *Commission* from him in the *Region* or *Countrie*, and were under the *Bishop of the City* and *Ordained* by him, and so were true *Bishops*, but not of the *Cities*, had *Ordination* as other *Bishops* had, though three *Bishops* were not by the *Canon* required to the ordaining of such, but onely that one *Bishop of the City*, whose *Proxy* or *Vicarius* the *Chorepiscopus* was: *Bishops* in cases of necessity, ordeined sine titulo, without a title or *City* to which they were affixt, and for some time allowed to ordaine *Presbyters* and *Deacons* in the *Countrie*, and to doe some other things in the *Bishop's* stead.

[5. All which is so largely set downe in the *Dissertations*, and vindicated so absolutely from serving the *Presbyterians* interest, that I must not for ever doe the same thing againe, transcribe what is there said abundantly, and nothing here objected against it, but that what I affirme of them, makes them to be not poperly *Bishops*. Where if by properly *Bishops* they meane *Bishops of Cities*, they say very true, for I affirme them to be, as their title assures me they were, *Regionary Bishops*, *Vicarii* and *Proxies* to the *City Bishop*.

But

But that they were *mere Presbyters*, and no more, and by their being *Presbyters* had the Power to *Ordeine* other *Presbyters* (which alone is the *Presbyterians* taske to make good, if they will have it usefull to the prooofe of their *conclusion*, their * 4. *Proposition*, That *Presbyters*, during the *Prevalency* * *Append p. 133* of *Episcopacy*, had not only an inherent power of *Ordination*, but in some cases did actually *ordeine*) this they doe not undertake to make good against the discourse in the *Dissertations*; And therefore I have no excuse to make any larger reply to them.

The Conclusion.

I Have now gone through every part of my designed Method, and not omitted one intimation of theirs, wherein I could thinke my selfe concerned; And that it may appeare that I should not have chosen this, as a reason, to begin any debate concerning a subject so forgotten in men's minds as *Episcopacy* is, I shall thus conclude the Readers trouble, without examining what else they say on this subject; having, I hope, competently secured my selfe from the Opinion of having formerly attempted to seduce any, so little either to his or my owne advantage.

THE END.